

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXI, 1.

WHOLE No. 81.

I.—INDO-IRANIAN STUDIES.

- I. a) *Ancient Persian Sibilants*;
- b) *Inflection*;
- c) *Translation of Behistān*, i.

PHONOLOGY.

The Ancient Persian Representation of *s*, *z*, and *sp*.

General literature.—Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, I² 728-739, 790-792; Bartholomae, *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, I 16-18, 165 seq., 187 seq.; Hübschmann, 'g', gh' im sanskrit und iranischen,' KZ. XXIII 384-400 (for the Anc. Pers., 395-398); Persische Studien, 198-214, 220-224; Foy, 'Die indg. gutturalen spiranten im Altpersischen,' KZ. XXXV 15-29.

The inscriptions of the Anc. Pers. show a rather frequent confusion in their employment of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. An attempt is here made to decide whether this confusion is due to dialectic differences or to a phonetic coincidence in the Anc. Pers. of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. The material offered by the inscriptions has been given as completely as possible, and it has been done independently either of Hübschmann or of Foy, to both of whom, however, I have been frequently indebted otherwise, as will appear in my citations below. The somewhat analogous case of the representation in Anc. Pers. of Iranian *sp* by *sp* or *s* also calls for attention, and it may be most conveniently discussed after a treatment of *s* and *z*.

A. *s* and *θ*.

Literature.—Sievers, Grundzüge der Phonetik⁴, 119 seq.; Braune, IF. IV 341 seqq.; in Sanskrit: Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, I 239–242; in younger Avesta (not common): Jackson, Avesta Grammar, 29; Caland, KZ. XXXIII 463 seq.; in Lakonic: Meyer, Griechische Grammatik⁵, 289 seq.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions with regard to *s* and *θ* is as follows:

1. *s*. *ayasatā* [cf. under Bh. i. §12], *aruvastam* [NRb. 4], *ardastāna*, *asman*, *asti*, *isu* [WB. *išu*, cf. Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq.], *upastā*, *usatašana*, *√ xšnās*, *gastā*, *√ tars*, *θastanaīy*, *dāsyaman* [WB. *dārayatā*; Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq., *dāsyamā*], *nisāya*, *√ pars*, *pasā*, *pasāva*, *pārsa*, *pisā*, *bastā*, *√ ras*, *rāsta*, *vaumisa*, *vasiy*, *saka*, *skuka*, *√ san* [doubtful; WB. substitute for its occurrences (Bh. iv. 71, 73, 77) *√ kan*], *√ sar* [Bh. iii. 91. This is the reading of Rawlinson and Spiegel; WB. *ākariyatām*], *sar[ā]* [? see Jackson, JAOS. XX 55], *sikayauvati*, *suguda*, *sugda*, *skudra*, *√ star* [?], *√ stā*, *stānam*, *sparda* [or *saparda*; cf. on this word below].

2. *θ*. *athqaina*, *athiy* [WB. rightly *athiy* in Bh. i. 91], *athiyābaušana*, *athura*, *amutha*, *avathā*, *xšāyathiya*, *gaidā*, *gāθu*, *θuvam*, *θaigrači* [so after Justi, ZDMG. LI 242 seq.], *θakatā*, *θatagu*, *√ θad*, *√ θah*, *θuxra*, *θuravāhara*, *θarda*, *niyaθārayam*, *duvarθi*, *pāθi*, *parθava*, *māθišta*, *yathā*, *viθ*, *viθa*, *viθiya*.

Discussion.—Aside from combinations of consonants, where *s* is invariably written, we have the following classification of the material just collected:

1. *a*. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *sk(h)* in *ayasatā* [see under Bh. i. §12], *√ xšnās*, *√ ras*, and according to a verbal suggestion of Prof. Jackson in *sara*-NRa. 52, which he compares with Sk. *chala* (cf. Gk. σκολιός, Lat. *scelus*, and for the phonology Jackson, Av. Gramm. 49; Wackernagel, Altind. Gramm. I 155 seq.). Oppert, JA., 4 sér., XIX 168, suggested *saranā*, but he compared Sk. *śaraṇa* instead of *chalana*. [Professor Jackson's discussion of *sara* has now appeared in JAOS. XX 55.]

b. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *k* in *vasiy*, *asariyatā* [? cf. sup.].

c. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *kh* in *√ san* [Bartholomae, KZ. XXVII 367; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 53 seq.].

d. *s* = Iran. *sč* in *pasā*, *pasāva* [cf. Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 50 f.; Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 209; also below under *sp*].

e. *s* = Iran. *θr* = Indog. *tr* in *vaumisa* [Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 13, 15, 18, 33]. Cf. also 'Ασιδάρης for **aθi°*, Justi, Iran. Namenb. 43.

f. *s* = Iran. *st* = Indog. *dt* in *usatašana* [WB. *ustašana*].

g. *s* = Iran. *š* in *isu* [WB. *išu*] (compare, however, Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq.).

h. *s* occurs in the foreign proper names *nisāya* [Median], *saka* [see Müller, WZKM. VII 258], *sikayauvati* [Hüsing, 27, reads *Sikayahvati*], *suguda*, *sugda*, *sparda* [Benfey and Rawlinson understood by this word Sparta; Spiegel, the Sepharad of Obadiah 20, which the Vulgate renders in *Bosphoro*. Lassen, ZKM. VI 50 referred to Σάρδεῖς < **σχαρδ°*. This is well defended by Meyer, IF. I 326-329, who compares also the form Σνάρης of Johann. Lydus, De mens. iii. 14; cf. also Müller, WZKM. II 93 seq., and Nöldeke, ibid. 92. This is the identification which I adopt. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 164, supposes Sparda to be "Lycie, conservée dans le grec Sarpedon," but Lewy, Semitische Fremdwörter im Griechischen, 193 seq., assigns a Semitic origin to Sarpedon].

i. *s* is of doubtful origin in the word *pisā*, which is of unknown signification (Bh. v. 25).

2. a. *θ* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̂* in *abagaina*, *θaigrači*, *θakatā*, *√θad*, *√θah*, *θuxra*, *θuravāhara*, *θarda*, *mabišta*, *viθ*, *viθiya*.

b. *θ* = Iran. *θ* = Indog. *th* in *amutha*, *avathā*, *xšāyathiya*, *gaidā*, *gādu*, *θuvam*, *duvardi*, *paθi*, *yaθā*.

c. *θ* = Iran. *sr* in *niyaθārayam* [?].

d. *θ* = Iran. *s* in the foreign names *athiyābaušana* [Hüsing, 20; Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, 50], *athura*, *θatagu*.

e. *θ* = Iran. *θ* in *parθava*.

Results from the Anc. Persian.—Iranian *s* initially is in general represented by *θ*, excepting in the roots *sar* and *san* (both rather doubtful). Again, *s* arising from *k̂* is retained before *i* only in *vasiy* in contrast with *mabišta* and *viθiya*. But this double rendering of *s* before *i* is in itself a confirmation of our right to assume a like mutual interchange of *s* and *θ* before *a* [against this view Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 209]. An additional example of

s before *a* is *āyasatā*, if Bartholomae's reading [Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 75] be adopted. In the foreign name *θalagu* the single change of initial *s* is also to be remarked.

s arising from *sč*, *dt*, or *š* never interchanges with *θ*.

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.—Instructive in this connection is the comparison of Anc. Pers. *θaigrači* = New Sus. *Saikurričiš* with Anc. Pers. *θuxra* = New Sus. *Tukkurra* (but Babylon. *Suhra*) and Anc. Pers. *θuravāhara* = N. Sus. *Tormar*. The equivalents of Anc. Pers. *θalagu* and *θura* are, on the other hand, in New Sus. *Sattakuš* and *Aššuran*, and in Babylon. *Sattagušu* and *Aššur*.

(For final results see below.)

B. *z* and *d*.

Literature.—In addition to the literature cited above, Hüsing, *Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften*, 26, and for the analogous representation in Elean of *δ = ð* by ζ, Meyer, *Griechische Grammatik*³, 269; Meister, *Griechische Dialekte*, II 52 seq.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions with regard to *z* and *d* is as follows:

1. *z*. *auramazdā*, *azdā*, [*iz*]āva, [WB. better [*hizuva*]m], *uvāra*[zm]i, *uvārazmiya*, *uzamayā*, *paruzana*, *paruv zana*, *paruv-zana*, *vazraka* [or *vazarka*], *vahyazdāta*, *zarqka*, *zazāna*, *zura*, *zurakara*.

2. *d*. *āšiyādiya*, *ada*, *adakaiy*, *adam*, *adukani*, *apadāna*, *ayādana*, *arakadri*, *artavardiya*, *ardaxčašča* [corrupt form on Art. Vase], *ardastāna*, *ardumani*, *aršādā*, *avadā*, *ahifrastādiy* [loc. sg.; cf. on this word now Bartholomae, IF. IX 257–260], *idā*, *upadarqma* [so correctly read by Oppert, *Le peuple . . . des Mèdes*, 121; Hüsing, 14, 38, 43], *uvadaičaya* [Müller, WZKM. VII 256, keeps the old reading *uvadaidaya* and compares Anc. Pers. *didā* and its cognate words], *kqpada*, *gqduṭava*, *gqḍāra*, *garmapada*, √ *gud*, √ *jad*, *jadi*, *taxmaspāda*, *taradraya*, *tigra-xauda*, *θarda*, *dauštar*, √ *danu*, √ *dar*, *draya*, √ *darš*, *dasta*, *dašabāri* [? cf. under Bh. i. §18], *dahyu*, √ *dā*, *dādarši*, *dāduhya*, *dārayavanu*, *dāsyaman* [NRd. WB. *dārqtā* (?); Justi, ZDMG. L 658, *dāsyamā*], *-dim*, √ *di*, *didā*, *dipi*, *dubāla*, *dura*, √ *duru*j,

duruva, duvaištam, duvarā, duvarθi, duvitātarnam, duvitiya, dušiyāra, drauga, draujana, drağa [WB. better *dargam*], *nadītabira, nabukudračara, nīpadiy, paīšiyāuvādā, patipadam, √pā, bardiya, bāgayādi, frāda, marduniya, mudrāya, yadā, yadiy, avarada, rādiy, vardana, vidā, vidarna, vīdafrā, vīdafranā, sparda, hadā, hadiš, hağguda, haldita, hiđu.*

Discussion.—These cases of *z* and *d* fall into the following classifications:

1. a. *z* = Iran. *z* in *auramazdā, azdā, [hizuva]m* [Spiegel *[iz]āva*], *uvāra[zm]i, uvārazmiya, uzamaya* [*z*+*d* giving *zz*, which is simplified to *z*], *paruzana, paruv zana, paruvzana, vazraka, vahyazdāta, zazāna, zura, zurakara.*

b. *z* = Iran. *d* in *zarqka.*

2. a. *d* = Iran. *d(h)* in *ada, adakaiy, adukani, ardaštāna, ardumani, aršādā, avadā, azdā, ahīfrastādiy, idā, upadarqma, uvadaičaya* [cf. above], *kqpada* [Hüsing, 38, *Kampanda*, after the New Sus. *Kampantaš*], *gqđutava* [Justi, Grundriss der iran.

Phil. II 430, to New Pers. گندم], *gqđāra, garmapada, √jad, jadiy, taxmaspāda, tighrahauda, θarda, √danu, √dar, √darš, dahyu, √dā, dādarši, dārayavau, dāsyaman* [see above], *-dim, didiy, dipi, dubāla, duraiy, √duru, duru, duvaištam, duvarā, duvarθi, duvitātarnam, duvitiya, dušiyāra, drauga, draujana, dargam, nadītibira, nabukudračara, nīpadiy, paīšiyāuvādā, patipadam, pādiy, frāda, mudrāya, rādiy, vardana, vidarna, vīdafrā, vīdafranā, sparda, hadā, hadiš, hağguda, haldita, hiđu.*

b. *d* = Iran. *z* in *āšiyādiya, adam, ayādana, artavardiya* [Justi, Iran. Namenb. 38], *√gud, taradraya, draya, dasta, adānā, dāduhya* [Babylonian *Zātu*], *√di* 'deprive,' *didā* [cf. New Pers. دز], *bardiya, bāgayādi, marduniya* [cf. Justi, Iran. Namenb. 195], *yadiy, avarada.*

c. *d* is of uncertain origin in *apadāna* [?], *arakadri* [probably for *d*, cf. the New Sus. *Arakkatarriš* and the Babylonian *Ara-kadri*], *dašabārim* [WB. *ušabārim*; Foy, KZ. XXXV 35 seq., reads *uštrabārim*; cf. below, §18], *yadā* [Bh. iii. 26 to *√yad* = Av. *yaz*; cf. Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. I 45, note. Foy, KZ. XXXV 43, emends *hačā ya[u]dāyā frarixta* "vom kriegszug zurückgelassen (d. i. zurückgeblieben)." I myself retain the old reading *yadā*], *vidā* [Bh. iv. 87—unintelligible].

Results from the Ancient Persian.—Ancient Persian *z* = Iran. *z* throughout except in *zarqka*, but Iran. *z* is represented more frequently in Anc. Pers. by *d* = *ḍ* [cf. Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 198 seq.]. Both *z* and *d* occur alike medially and finally, and no fixed law can be laid down concerning their interchange any more than concerning *s* and *θ*. It is to be noted that in all the modern Iranian dialects except New Persian, Iran. *z* becomes *d* only in loan-words from the Persian, *z* being in all other cases preserved [Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 221].

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.

1. a. Anc. Pers. *d* = Babylon. *z* in Anc. Pers. *Artavardiya* = Babylon. *Artavarziya*; Anc. Pers. *Dāduhya* = Babylon. *Zātu*, but New Sus. *Tattuhiya*; Anc. Pers. *Bardiya* = Babylon. *Barziya*, but New Sus. *Pirtiya*.

b. Anc. Pers. *d* = Babylon. *d* = New Sus. *t* in Anc. Pers. *dipi* = Babylon. *duppu* [a Semitic word] = New Sus. *tuppi*.

c. Anc. Pers. *d* = New Sus. *t* throughout (e. g. Anc. Pers. *Dubāla* = New Sus. *Tupala*, Anc. Pers. *dahyauš* = New Sus. *taiyiauš*), except in the case of *zana*.

2. a. Anc. Pers. *z* = Babylon. *z* = New Sus. *ṣ*(*š*) in Anc. Pers. *Zarqka* = Babylon. *Zarangā* = New Sus. *Čaranka*(*š*), Anc. Pers. *Zazāna* = Babylon. *Zazannu* = New Sus. *Čač'an*.

b. Anc. Pers. *z* = New Sus. *t* only in *zazānam* = New Sus. *tanaš-pe-na*, Xerx. Pers. ca 7, and in the other occurrences of *zana* (Dar. Pers. a 3-4, NRa. 8, Dar. Elv. 14, Xerx. Pers. a 7, ca 7, Van. 12). [Cf. on *zana* now Remy, JAOS. XX 70. The Ancient Persian word has been borrowed in Biblical Aramaic זנא and in Syriac *znā*.]

(For final result see below.)

C. *sp*.

Literature.—Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 29 seq., and the authors there quoted; Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 178; Foy, KZ. XXXV 19 seq.; Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 24-26.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions for the double representation in Anc. Pers. by *sp* and *s* of Iranian *sp* = Indog. *ḱu* is as follows:

1. *sp.* *aspačanā*, *uvaspa*, *taxmaspāda*, *vayaspāra*, *vispazana*, *vištāspa*, σπακα [Median], Σπιθπαδάτης.
2. *s.* *asagarta*, *asagartiya*, *asabāri*, *visa*, *visadahyu*.

Discussion.—These cases are sufficiently classified by the presentation of the material.

Results from the Ancient Persian.—The proper names in which *sp* is retained are usually explained as Median. With *visa* is compared Old Slavic *visi* and Lithuanian *visas*, while *as^bari* is a case of haplology [further examples in Brugmann, *Vergl. Gramm.* I² 858]. Horn's explanation of *asabāri* as from **assa^o* [Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, Nos. 160, 749] is rejected by Hübschmann, *Pers. Stud.* 77, and by Bartholomae, *Grundriss der iran. Philol.* I 29. Müller's connection, *WZKM.* VIII 182–183, of *asa* with ὤσις is wrong. Notwithstanding this, I believe that Horn is right. We find precisely the same development in the Pāli-Prākṛit *assa*, *vissa* for Skt. *aśva*, *viśva* = Av. *aspa*, *vispa*. But in Avestan *sp* can hardly become *s* as is suggested by Horn, No. 749, note, and by Hüsing, 25, for *Asabana* of Yašt, v. 73; xiii. 140 [the correct view is given by Justi, *Iran. Namenb.* 42].

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.

1. *a.* Anc. Pers. *sp* = New Sus. *šp* = Babylon. *sp* in Anc. Pers. *Aspačina* = New Sus. *Ašpačana* = Babylon. *Aspašina*; Anc. Pers. *Taxmaspāda* = New Sus. *Takmašpata*; Anc. Pers. *Vayaspāra* = New Sus. *Mišparra* = Babylon. *Visparū*; Anc. Pers. *Vispauzatiš* = New Sus. *Mišpaučatiš*; Anc. Pers. *Vištāspa* = New Sus. *Mištašpa* = Babylon. *Vistaspi*; Anc. Pers. *vispazana* = New Sus. *mišpazanaš* (Dar. Pers. a 3, where only the New Sus. text has this addition: 'of all nations').

b. Anc. Pers. *sp* = New Sus. *šš* in Anc. Pers. *vispazana* = New Sus. *miššatanaš* (NRa. 8).

2. *a.* Anc. Pers. *s* < Iran. *sp* = New Sus. *šš* (= Babylon. *sk*!) in Anc. Pers. *Asagartiya* = New Sus. *Aššakartiya* (= Babylon. *Iskartai*); Anc. Pers. *visadahyuš* = New Sus. *miššatayihuš* (Xerx. Pers. a 11 f.).

(For final result see below.)

D. Final Result.

The confusion in Ancient Persian in the use of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*, is explained by Bartholomae, *Grundriss der iran. Philol.* I 166, as due to dialect-mixture, and this theory has been carried still further by Hüsing (15, 23 seq.) on the basis of the representation by New Sus. š(š) of Anc. Pers. *θ*, *θr*, *t(a)r*, and *s*, and again by the New Sus. transcription with *t*+vowel+*r* of Anc. Pers. *θr* and *t(a)r*. The explanation by dialect-mixture is fatally easy, but the promiscuous use of forms of different dialects is hardly to be expected in an official language, such as that which is being considered—proper names, of course, excepted.

Conclusion.—Our conclusion, at least temporarily, is as follows :

For A, B. At a very early period in Persia, before the time of Darius, there had begun the process which resulted in the phonetic equivalence of *s* and *θ*, and similarly of *z* and *ð* (*d* in script) [similarly to be explained is the interchange of *s* and *θ* in Avesta and of such cases as the Av. *yezi* beside *yedzi*].¹ The consequence of this equivalence of sound, combined with a lack of etymological feeling, was the confusion of usage of the characters for *s* and *θ*, and for *z* and *d*, which we have observed.

For C. Simultaneously with the phenomena just discussed, there was in process of development another *s*, which arose from the assimilation of two juxtaposed consonants. Three such combinations will engage our attention here. One was, if our course of argument has been correct, *sp* which became *ss*, and is consequently written *s*. The second assimilation was that of Aryan *tr* which developed through the intermediate stage of Iran. *θr* to *s* in "the dialect with which the Elamites had most to do" [Hüsing, 15, 18].

The third assimilation is in *pasā*, *pasāva* from **pasča* (Av. *pasča*, *paskāt*; Sk. *paścā*, *paścāt*; Lithuan. *pāskui*) through the same medial stage *ss* [Bartholomae, *Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte*, II 50-51, does not favor this. Against his view see Foy, *KZ.* XXXV 22, 26, who also compares Sk. *acchā* from **at*

¹As a similar phonetic development in an entirely different group of languages, I may cite the modern Persian and Egyptian pronunciation of the Arabic *t* (p) and *d* (ð) as *s* and *z* respectively. As Avestan examples of an interchange between *s* and *θ* in late texts, I note from the variae lectiones of Vend. xix. *jasāhi* (§18) Jp 1, *s* also in Mf 2, L 1. 2. Br 1. K 10. M 2, but *jaθāi* L 4. K 1; *fraθō* (§19) beside *frasō* K 1. L 4; *pairiθnəm* (§28) Jp 1. Mf 2. L 1. 2, *pairisinəm* K 1, *pairižnəm* L 4. Numerous other cases might be given.

(cf. Lat. *ad*) + *cha*].¹ The only other combination of *s* + *č* in Anc. Pers. is *kašči*, where the feeling for the enclitic *-či* has prevented any assimilation (so also in the case of *š* < *t* in *avašči*, *čišči*, etc.).

This *s* arising from assimilation is never confused with Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̑*. In other words, it never approached the phonetic value *p*.

We have sought to show that there is no law which determines when we shall find *s* and when *θ*, when *z* and when *d*, and also that this absence of rule is not due to any dialect-mixture or similar cause. There remains the explanation which we have endeavored to uphold: the phonetic equivalence and consequent confusion of usage of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. Attention has also been drawn to precisely similar phenomena presented by the Lakonic and Elean dialects of the Greek. Lastly, the degeneration of the old Iranian *s* toward the value *p* receives an additional confirmation, when we note the sharp distinction in the case of *s* arising from assimilation which nowhere in the inscriptions interchanges with *θ*. Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 115, has called attention to the fact that of all the Iranian dialects only the Ancient Persian, with its successors the Middle and New Persian, shows this confusion in the usage of *s* and *θ*, of *z* and *d*.

[While the final proof of this paper is still in my hands, the valuable studies of Dr. Hüsing, 'Altiranische Mundarten, I' and 'Zur persischen Lautlehre,' KZ. XXXVI 556-571, have appeared. Despite the arguments by which he seeks to prove the existence of the six Ancient Iranian vernaculars which he calls the *missa*-, *mitara*, *miθa*- [these three in the Anc. Pers. inscriptions in his view], *miθra*- [Avesta according to him], *mitr*-, and *mihr(a)*-dialects, I am unable as yet to find myself converted to his theory. His method of operating almost exclusively with proper names is not perhaps altogether invulnerable. I am, moreover, well aware of the fact that where the Anc., Middle, and Mod. Pers. have *d*, but the Avesta has *z*, the Afyān, Balūci, Kurdish, Ossetish, and Persian dialects have *z* likewise [see now Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 2, 82-83, 90-91, 205, 209, 236, 258-259, 305, 352, 385, 414, and with regard to the problem of *s* and *θ*, *ibid.* 85-86, 93-94, 305, 352, 385]. I am still unwilling, notwithstanding this, to see in the official inscriptions of the Ancient Persian kings "eine

¹ In favor of the view here sustained I may now cite Bangalī *pāsā* 'after' beside *pāchā* from Skt. *pāścā*. Grierson, ZDMG. L 25; cf. Bhandarkar, J. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. XVII 2, 173.

mischsprache aus zwei verschiedenen mundarten" (Hüsing, 562). I still hold to the explanation which I have suggested above for the varying usage in Anc. Pers. of *s* beside *θ*, and of *z* beside *d*—namely, to the hypothesis that these sounds *s* and *θ*, *z* and *d* had become in the Anc. Pers. phonetically equivalent.]

INFLECTION.

Nominative Singular of -as-Stems.

Literature.—Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 214 seq.

The solution of the Ancient Persian phrases such as xiv. *raučiabiš θakatā āha* has been often tried. The word *θakatā* is generally considered now as the loc. sg. of an -i-stem [Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 227], but the old view that *raučiabiš* is an instr. with comitative force is still held by Bartholomae, op. cit. 246, "Mit dem 14. Tage im Vjachna-Monat, in [dessen] Verlauf war es, als er sich auflehnte" (similarly Foy, KZ. XXXV 33, 68). To Prof. Jackson I owe the suggestion that *raučiabiš* is the inst. pl. used as a general plural case, exactly as in Avestan [Jackson, Av. Gramm. 67; Schmidt, Pluralbildungen, 98 seqq., 259 seqq.; cf. also Bartholomae, Arische Forschungen, II 104. Foy's arguments, KZ. XXXIII 426-430, against any general plural case fail to convince me]. This would give the rendering: 'xiv days were in course.' On my attempt to explain similarly the difficult *viḍibiš*, see under Bh. i. §14 [against this explanation both of *raučiabiš* and *viḍibiš*, Schmidt, Pluralb. 266 seq.].

This view of *raučiabiš* leads of itself to a consideration of the similar phrase in Bh. iii. 8: *garmaḥpadahya māhyā i. rauča θakatā āha* 'Of the month Garmapada one day was in course.' Here *rauča* is not an accusative, as Spiegel, Keilinschr.² 238, and Hübschmann, Casuslehre, 293, say, but the nom. sg. as subject of *āha*.

Another nominative of the -as-stems is found in Sz. c 9: *hačā pirāva nāma rauta tya mudrāyay danauvatiy* [Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 195, reads *danautiy*, *danutaiy*, or *danuvatiy* for this last word] 'From a river, Nile by name, which flows in Egypt.' Bang, ZDMG. XLIII 534, makes *rauta* the accusative after *hačā*, and he compares Bh. i. 50-51: *karāšim hačā daršam atarsa* 'The people were mightily afraid of him.' The explanation of Thumb, KZ. XXXII 129, by an anakoluthon

fails to observe the idiom of the language, and Foy's "compound," KZ. XXXV 32, is rather more artificial than necessary. The reading of Müller, WZKM. I 224, *hačā pirāva* [ablative = Av. **piraōt*] *nāma rautata*, need not be dwelt upon. The true explanation is that of Bartholomae, BB. XIV 249, who makes *rauta* the nominative and compares for the construction Bh. iii. 12-14: *pasāva adam frāišayam dādaršiš nāma pārsa mana bqdaka baxtariyā xšaθ apāvā* 'Afterward I sent a Persian, Dādarši by name, my servant, satrap in Bactria,' also Bh. i. 36-37: *hačā paiši[yā]uvādāyā arakadriš nāma kaufa* 'From a hill, Arakadri by name, in Paišiyāvāda' [cf. Hübschmann, Casusl. 289 seq.]. In the light of this Bartholomae's omission of any nom. sg. of the -as-stems in the Grundriss der iran. Philol. must be an oversight.

TRANSLATION.

Behistān, I.

§1, lines 1-3. I am Darius, the great king, king of kings, king in Persia, king of lands, son of Hystaspes, grandson of Arsames, an Achaemenian.

§2, lines 3-6. Saith Darius the king: My father [was] Hystaspes. The father of Hystaspes [was] Arsames. The father of Arsames was Ariaramnes. The father of Ariaramnes [was] [Teispes]. The father of Teispes was Achaemenes.

§3, lines 6-8. Saith Darius the king: Therefore we are called Achaemenians. From aforetime we have been tested. From aforetime our house hath been kings.

§4, lines 8-11. Saith Darius the king: Eight of my house, they were kings before. I am the ninth. Nine from days of old we are kings.

§5, lines 11-12. Saith Darius the king: By the grace of Ormazd I am king. Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom.

§6, lines 12-17. Saith Darius the king: These lands, they came unto me. By the grace of Ormazd I am their king: Persia, Susiana, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, those of the sea, Sparda [Sardis?], Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara [Kandahar? Oppert], Scythia, Sattysgia, Arachosia, Maka [Mekran?] —altogether twenty-three lands.

§7, lines 17-20. Saith Darius the king: These lands, they came unto me. By the grace of Ormazd they were my subjects. They brought me tribute. What was said unto them by me either by night or day, that they did.

§8, lines 20-24. Saith Darius the king: Within these lands the man who was a friend, I treated him well. Who was a foe, I administered a good inquisition to him. By the grace of Ormazd these lands obeyed what [were] my laws. As it was proclaimed by me unto them, so they did.

tyanā: Benfey, Pers. Keilinschr. 9; Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70; and Foy, KZ. XXXV 45, Anm., think that it has received its *-nā* from the following *manā* by dittography, but this fails to explain fully the *-ā*. The majority, as Oppert, JA., 4. sér., XVII 287; Hübschmann, Casusl. 298; Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 236 (hesitatingly); and Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. II 782, regard this word as an instr. (cf. Av. *ka-na* beside *kā*, Skt. *kē-na*, *tē-na*, *ē-na*). Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 227 seq., made it an abl. Müller's attempt in WZKM. VII 112 to explain the *-n* as for an *-hm-* arising from *-sm-* fails to convince me (cf. Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 166, 169, 237). I must give my adherence to the rendering of Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70: "diese länder, was meine gesetze sind, die ehrten sie" (for similar cases of *tya* standing alone as a compound relative see Bh. iv. 42, 49, 53; Xerx. Pers. b 30, da [db] 19, Art. a 35; cf. also Xerx. Pers. a 19-20, ca [cb] 13-14). This rendering agrees very closely with the Babylonian text (the New Susian version here is lost), *dēnātu attūā ina birit mātāti agānētū ušazkū* (?) 'these laws were fulfilled (?) within these lands (cf. Bezold's text and translation). My only suggestion is to regard the *n* in *tyanā* not as a dittography, but as an analogical formation after the instrumental. Other instances of a similar insertion of *n* through false analogy are not lacking in Iranian pronouns. An Avestan case in point is *ēinəm* beside the regular *kəm*, *ēīm* 'whom?' and for the Old Persian we may cite the troublesome *yanaīy* C 22 (Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 236-237). Müller's explanation of *yanaīy*, WZKM. XII 76-77, is unsatisfactory. The third instance of the analogical use of *n* is in the word *aniyanā*, Dar. Pers. d 11, e 20. This is, as Spiegel (and Foy, KZ. XXXV 10; 52) have rightly seen, an ablative which has fallen together in form with

the instrumental on account of the loss of the final *-t*. These parallel cases, *šinəm*, *yanaiy*, and *aniyanā* would seem to favor my view that *tyanā* also is an instance of false analogy after the instrumental singular rather than a dittography arising from the final *-nā* of the following word *manā*.

§9, lines 24-26. Saith Darius the king: Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom. Ormazd brought me help until this kingdom was held. By the grace of Ormazd I hold this kingdom.

§10, lines 26-35. Saith Darius the king: This [is] what was done by me after that I became king. One Cambyses by name, the son of Cyrus, of our house, was king here before. Of that Cambyses there was a brother, Bardiya by name, having the same mother and the same father as Cambyses. Afterward Cambyses killed that Bardiya. When Cambyses killed Bardiya, the people had no knowledge that Bardiya was killed. Afterward Cambyses went to Egypt. When Cambyses went to Egypt, then the people became hostile. Then the Lie waxed at will in the land, both in Persia, and in Media, and in the other lands.

azdā: Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 143 (cf. now IF. IX 279-281), considers *azdā* to be the locative singular of an *i*-stem used adverbially (on the syntax cf. Delbrück, Altind. Synt. 202 seq.). Johansson, IF. II 28, with whom I agree, regards Anc. Pers. *azdā* as a noun in the nom.

avajata: For my reading, with correction of the stone, of *avājata* (i. e. $\sqrt{\text{jan}} + \text{ava} + \tilde{a}$ as in all other cases of *avāj*^o) see Rawlinson's lithograph of Bh. i. 32: *av^a letter j^a t^a*. This gap I would fill with *a*.

§11, lines 35-43. Saith Darius the king: Afterward there was a man, a Magian, Gaumāta by name. He arose from a hill, Arakadri by name, in Paīšiyauvādā, [yea, even] from there. Of the month Viyaxna fourteen days were in course when he arose. He thus lied unto the people: I am Bardiya, the son of Cyrus, the brother of Cambyses. Afterward the people all became confederate from Cambyses. They went over to that man, both Persia, and Media, and the other lands. He seized the kingdom. Of the month Garmapada nine days were in course. Then he seized the kingdom. Afterward Cambyses died by his own hand.

māhyā: Bartholomae, BB. IX 309 seq., Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 215; Horn, 'Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie,' No. 968; Foy, KZ. XXXV 5, take this as the loc. sg. of *māh* [Av.

māh, Skt. *mās*] + *ā*. It is, however, far better to return to the old view and to consider *māhyā* as standing for the genitive *māhahya* from *māha* [Av. *māpha*, Skt. *māsa*]. The material offered by the inscriptions for the retention or omission of *h* = Indog. *s* in the Anc. Pers. combination -*āhā*- is as follows [for Avesta examples see Jackson, Av. Gramm. 102, 131, 148, 154]:

1. *h* is retained: *auramazdāhā*, *anahata*, *āvahanam*, *ahatiy*, *āham*, *āha*, *āhātā*, *parikarāhadiš* [WB. *parikarāh[i]diš*], *xšnās-āhadiš*], *aḥaham*, *aḥaha*, *θuravāhara*, *nāha*, *fraharva*, *bagāha*, *patiyāvahaiy*, *vahauka*, *visanāhadiš* [WB. *vikanāh[i]diš*], *frā-hajam*.

2. *h* is omitted: *θāhy*, *θātiy*, *āpariyāya* [if it is to be connected with Skt. *√sap*, Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 85, 196; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70], *vivāna* [cf. Av. *vivānāhā* and see Justi, Iran. Namenb. 374].

If *māhyā* were a locative, *Viyaxnahya* could only be an "appositional genitive," an explanation which does not appeal to me here. On the construction of *rauḥabiš* see above under the 'Nominative Singular of -as-Stems.'

§12, lines 43-48. Saith Darius the king: This kingdom of which Gaumāta the Magian deprived Cambyses, this kingdom from aforetime belonged to our house. Afterward Gaumāta the Magian deprived Cambyses both of Persia, and of Media, and of the other lands. He assumed [it = the kingdom (?) and] made [it] under his own dominion. He became king.

ayastā: Notwithstanding the criticisms of Foy, KZ. XXXV 33 seq., I have made the above rendering in full accord with Bartholomae, BB. XIV 246 seq. [cf. the same scholar, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 75], who compares for the single object of two verbs the following three passages: a. Bh. ii. 87-88: *kā[ra] hya manā . . . Čiθ'antaxmam agarbāya anaya abiy mām* 'My army . . . seized, brought unto me Čiθ'antaxma.' b. Bh. iv. 42-43: *tya manā kartam varnavatām θuvām māt[ya duruxtam man]iyāhy* 'Let my deed [or what hath been done of me] seem true to thee, deem it not false' (*kartam* being the subject of *varnavatām* and the object of *man]iyāhy*). c. Bh. iv. 70-72: *[tu]vam kā hya aparam imām dipim vaināhy tyām adam niyapišam imaiivā patikarā mātya vikanāhy yāvā jī[vāhy]* 'O thou who in time to come shalt behold this tablet which I have cut or these pictures, destroy [them] not so long as thou livest.' Foy's objections certainly fail in the case of a, even if we grant them in b and c.

Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 229 seq., and formerly Bartholomae, Handbuch, 209, regarded *ayastā* as the nom. of a noun in *-ar* governing the acc. as does *kāma* in Bh. iv. 35 and NRa. 38. Benfey, Pers. Keilinschr. 18, compared Sk. *āyatta* 'dependent upon' [similarly Hoffmann, BB. XVIII 285 seq., who construed *ayastā* as the instr. sg.]. The use of *āyasatā* [so to be read with Bartholomae instead of *ayastā*] is similar in Bh. iii. 4, 42. Perhaps one may compare also the asyndeton in such passages as Bh. iv. 57-58: *yadiy imām haḍugām apagaudayāhy naiy θāh[y kārāhyā Auramaz]dātay jatā biyā* 'if thou shalt conceal this inscription, not speak unto the people, may Ormazd slay thee.' It is also noteworthy that the New Susian renders *āyasatā* by the verb *emituš*, which is the regular translation of the Anc. Pers. root *di* 'deprive.' The Anc. Pers. *uvāipašiyam akutā* appears in New Susian as *tuman-e* 'zum Besitztum'; cf. Foy, ZDMG. LII 570, 564.

§13, lines 48-61. Saith Darius the king: There was not a man, either a Persian, or a Median, or any of our house, who would make Gaumāta the Magian deprived of his kingdom. The people were mightily afraid of him. "He would be killing at will the people that had known the former Bardiya." For this reason he would be killing the people: "That they may not know that I am not Bardiya, the son of Cyrus." No one dared to say aught concerning Gaumāta the Magian until I came. Afterward I implored Ormazd. Ormazd brought me help. Ten days of the month Bāgayādi were in course. Then I with a few men killed that Gaumāta the Magian and those men who were his foremost followers in a stronghold Sikayauvati by name in a land Nisaia by name in Media. There I killed him. I deprived him of the kingdom. By the grace of Ormazd I became king. Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom.

avājaniyā: An iterative optative from *√jan+ava+ā* [cf. Stackelberg, Beiträge zur Syntax des Ossetischen, 77]. For similar phenomena in Avestan see Bartholomae, Altiran. Verb. 212, 216; KZ. XXVIII 37; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 127; Jackson, PAOS. XVII clxxxvii; and cf. Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. II 372 seq. The idea of Spiegel, Vergl. Gramm. 344, and of Foy, KZ. XXXV 34, that this word is an augmented optative, I can not accept.

§14, lines 61-71. Saith Darius the king: The kingdom that had been taken away from our house, that I established. I set it

in its place. As before, so I made the places of worship which Gaumāta the Magian had digged down. I restored to the people the servants (?), and the live-stock (?), and the real estate, and the private property (?) of which Gaumāta the Magian had deprived them. I set the people in their place, both Persia, and Media, and the other lands. As before, so I brought back what had been taken away. By the grace of Ormazd I did this. I toiled until I set our family in its place as before. So I toiled by the grace of Ormazd that Gaumāta the Magian did not take away our family.

niyaθārayam: The Av. $\sqrt{srār} + ni$ of Vd. xviii. 51: *iməm mē narəm nīsrārayā* 'This man shalt thou restore to me' [similarly already Justi, Handb. der Zendspr. 307; cf. also Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 71]. Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. I³ 856 seq., connects this $\sqrt{srār}$ with the Av. *nīsrinao'ti* [see among other passages again Vd. xviii. 51, and cf. Sk. \sqrt{sri} , Gk. κλίνω, etc.], and he thus supposes a progressive disappearance of the spirant.

abicariš: The reading *abācariš* is adopted by Spiegel. This has been best defended by Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. II 129-131, who connects *abācariš* with the Sk. *sabhā* and the \sqrt{car} , its modern representative being the New Pers. بازار. Darmesteter's view is refuted by Horn, Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, No. 166, because of the Pahl. *vāčār* 'bazaar' [cf. also Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 23]. Bartholomae's suggestion [apud Horn, loc. cit., and Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 149], *q̄bācariš*, *aba'ācariš* 'aqueducts,' is not to be adopted on account of the sense. The same criticism must be made of the derivation by Müller, WZKM. IV 108, from **āp-ācari*. Spiegel's translation 'Weideplätze' implies a connection with New Pers. جریدن 'to pasture' [see Horn, Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, No. 439]. He is followed by Rugarli, who renders *abicariš gaiθāmčā māniyamčā viθibiščā* by 'i pascoli, le campagne, le case, i vici.' The better reading *abičariš* is Rawlinson's, who is followed by WB.

The word *abičariš* also has been explained in several ways. Oppert, JA., 4. sér., XVII 404, 410, renders it 'en sauveur' [cf. the same scholar, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 167]. Bang, ZDMG. XLIII 527 seq., and IF. VII 294, translates 'Hülfsmittel [zum Unterhalt].' This appeals to me no more than Foy's connection with $\sqrt{bhā}$ 'shine' [ZDMG. L 132]. Both Rawlinson and Kern,

ZDMG. XXIII 235, appear to me to have come nearest the solution. For we must compare the Sk. *abhicara* 'servant, attendant,' and we must see in the word a neuter abstract of the *-iṣ*-stems like *hadiṣ* [Xerx. Pers. da [db] 16, Xerx. Pers. ca [cb] 11]. On this formation, which is especially close to and often interchanges with that in *-as*, see Brugmann, *Vergl. Gramm.* II 398 seq.; for the Indo-Iranian, Schmidt, *Pluralb.* 378-387; for the Iranian, Spiegel, *Vergl. Gramm.* 175; Bartholomae, *Grundriss der iran. Philol.* I 95-96; for the Avestan, Justi, *Handb. der Zendspr.* 370; Jackson, *Av. Gramm.* 102-103; for the Ancient Persian, Spiegel, *Keilinschr.*³ 169; for the Sanskrit, Lindner, *Altind. Nominalb.* 60. Compare also the analogous use of Lat. *seruitium* = *seruos*, e. g. Tac. Ann. xii. 17: *seruitii decem milia offerebant*; Vell. Paterculus, ii. 82, 3: *calonum seruitiique desiderata tertia [pars] est*; and see Schmidt, *Pluralb.* 12-20.

Tolman's translation, *Transact. Wisconsin Acad.* VIII 244, by 'commerce' is not altogether bad. Foy, KZ. XXXV 35, is right in saying that the absence of *-lā* after *abiṣariṣ* does not militate against a syntactic equality with the following words. I must therefore differ for the present from Bang, *Mélanges Charles de Harlez*, 10.

māniyam: At first I connected this word, as does Foy, KZ. XXXV 73, with the \sqrt{man} , Gk. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$, etc., but I now prefer the older and better comparison with YAv. *nmāna*, GAv. *d'māna*, Gk. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omega$, etc. Bang's connection of Anc. Pers. *māniya* [ZDMG. XLIII 528] with Lat. *mānus*, $\sqrt{mā}$ is less happy, and has been withdrawn by him [cf. Bartholomae, *Grundriss der iran. Philol.* I 183]. Neither can I accept Oppert's translation [*Le peuple . . . des Mèdes*, 119]: "Et je restituai, en faveur du peuple, et la croyance et la langue, et je rendis aux familles ce que Gomatès le Mage leur avait enlevé." Darmesteter, *Étud. Iran.* II 129-131, has compared with the *gaiṭā* and *māniya* here the Avestan *gaēṭha* and *vis*. His rendering of the crux is: "(je rendis aussi) les marchés, les fermes et les maisons aux clans."

viṭibiṣlā: The old rendering (e. g. in Spiegel, and retained by Schmidt, *Pluralb.* 266 seq., and by Justi, *Grundriss der iran. Philol.* II 426 seq.) 'according to clans' is not to be received, as Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 235, already saw. Little better is WB.'s 'in den Häusern (?)'. Foy previously, in KZ. XXXIII 424-432, took *viṭibiṣ* as a sociative inst. pl. m. 'with his clanmates.' His parallels were Bh. iv. 73-74 and Xerx. Pers. a 15, but the *-lā*

which he accepted [page 420] is against such an interpretation. Foy's later interpretation [ZDMG. L 134 seq.] as *viðbaīša* [cf. Rawlinson, JRAS., O. S. X xviii, on the doubtful reading of the *ē*] from *vi + baiša*^h, with a comparison of Av. *vīθbaēša*, Ved. *vidvēsās*, to which he gives the meaning 'peace,' is well worthy of consideration, though a trifle abstract. Bartholomae, AF. II 104, struck the right note when he assumed that the word is used as the acc. pl. [Less good is his rendering, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 226, as an adverb, 'und überhaupt,' thus making it from *viθa* = Sk. *viśvā* (?).] My own explanation, at least temporarily, is that *viðibišcā* is an inst. neut. pl. used as an accus. [cf. on *raučabiš* above under Inflection], and that it comes from a neut. sg. **viðin-*. If this be right, we are to compare for the meaning the gloss of Hesychios *οικεία* *ἰδία*, and we see a climax of rapacity at the expense of the Persians, while indulgences were lavished on the other parts of the empire. From the Persians were snatched first the slaves, which could be most easily seized, and last of all even their personal effects. This may throw light on the words of Herodotos, iii. 67: ἀπεδέξατο ἐς τοὺς ὑπηκόους πάντας εὐεργεσίας μεγάλας, ὥστε ἀποθανόντος αὐτοῦ πόθον ἔχειν πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ παρὲξ αὐτῶν Περσέων [cf. Spiegel, Keilinschr.² 88-89].

parābara: Since we have the indicative, an *actual* result is stated, as was rightly seen by Foy, KZ. XXXIII 423 seq., and Müller, WZKM. III 147, as against Kern, Spiegel, and WB. Oppert's rendering, JA., 4. sér., XVII 404, is right as regards the indicative, but he errs, in my judgment, in not making *γathā* the relative of *avathā*. He thus translates: "Je l'ai arrangé par la volonté d'Ormazd comme ç'avait été avant moi, lorsque Gaumatès le Mage n'avait pas usurpé (notre palais) notre pays."

[Since these lines were first written an able article by Justi has appeared, ZDMG. LIII 89-92, in answer to Foy's criticism, *ibid.* LII 592, of his rendering of this difficult §14 in the Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 426-427. Professor Justi reads *abāčariš* (Skt. *sabhācarā*), which he renders by 'des Volkes Versammlung.' He further regards *gaiθā* as referring to 'the possessions of the nobility,' while *viðibiš* seems to have a dative force. It is especially pleasing to see that he too considers *abāčariš gaiθāmčā māniyamčā* as collective singulars. This last word he compares with the Greek *οικείος* in the sense of *οικέτης*, *οικεύς*, as I had already sought to trace an analogous development of meaning between *viðibiš* and *οικεία* *ἰδία*.]

§15, lines 71-72. Saith Darius the king: This [is] what I did after that I became king.

§16, lines 72-81. Saith Darius the king: When I killed Gaumāta the Magian, afterward a man, *Āθ'ina* by name, the son of Umpadarānma, he arose in Susiana. To the people he said thus: I am king in Susiana. Afterward Susiana became confederate. It went over to that *Āθ'ina*. He became king in Susiana. And a man, a Babylonian, Nidintubel by name, the son of Aniri, he arose at Babylon. The people he deceived thus: I am Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabūnā'id. Afterward the Babylonian people all went over to that Nidintubel. Babylon became confederate. He seized the kingdom in Babylon.

§17, lines 81-83. Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Susiana. That *Āθ'ina* was brought bound unto me. I killed him.

§18, lines 83-90. Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Babylon against that Nidintubel, who called himself Nebuchadrezzar. The army of Nidintubel held the Tigris. There it stood and hardby (?) was a fleet (?). Afterward I divided the army in two halves (?). The one I made archers (?), for the other I provided horses. Ormazd brought me help. By the grace of Ormazd we crossed the Tigris. Afterward there I killed at will the army of Nidintubel. Of the month *Āθ'iyādiya* twenty-six days were in course. Then we made battle.

abiš: For this word I can offer no better explanation than to consider it an adverb [so already Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 237]. For the -š we must compare Anc. Pers. *patiy* with *patiš*, Sk. *mithū* with *mithus*, Gk. *ἀμφί* with *ἀμφίς*, *ἀντικρῦ* with *ἀντικρὺς* [for further examples see Schmidt, Pluralb. 359 seq., and cf. Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, I 75 seq.].

nāviyā: The sense forbids us to consider this the loc. sg. + *ā*. Kern's abstract formation to *nāv* is perhaps the best view. Müller, WZKM. XI 252, makes precisely the same explanation, which is far better than his former rendering, WZKM. I 221, 'und dabei waren Schiffe' [cf. Bartholomae, BB. XIV 242, and Foy, KZ. XXXV 35].

madyakāuvā avākanam: So WB. Spiegel, *-makāuvā avākanam*. Rawlinson, *-m . . (?) kāuvā aw . . . (?) kanam* [cf. his 'Notes on the Text,' xlv seq.]. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, *kamakāuvā* 'portiuunculas.' Kern, *amakāuvā*. He

compares the Gk. ἀμίς (which usually signifies *matella*), and refers for the meaning to Aischylos, Supplices 811:

σοῦσθε, σοῦσθ' ὀλόμεναι ὀλόμεν' ἐπαμίδα.

Müller, WZKM. I 220, reads (*da*)*makāuvā avākanam*, but his translation 'Erdhäuschen' [*dam* 'build'] is rather strained. Later, WZKM. XI 252, Müller proposes *ramakāuvā* 'in troops' and compares Pahl. *ramak*, New Pers. رماک. This is very good. Foy suggests *ardakāuvā avākarnam*. The only clue to the meaning that we have is the following *aniyam . . . aniyahyā*. I follow Foy in comparing with *arda-* the Ossetic *ardäg*, *ärdäg* 'half,' Sk. *ardhaka* [Apte, Sk.-Eng. Dict. 169; cf. Böhtlingk-Roth, VII, Sp. 1703], Av. *ar^{da}*, but his *avākarnam* < **avakrⁿ'nam* is a little dubious, in spite of the weighty authority of Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 74. The copy of Rawlinson shows that eleven letters are damaged in this place between *kāram* and *-nam*. If we read *ardakaya*, loc. du. (cf. Av. forms like *zastayō*), and take the simple verb of Foy's *avākarnam*, we fill the gap exactly, having in *ardakaya akarnam* ten letters plus one space for the wedge of separation. Foy's explanation of *ardakāuvā*, KZ. XXXV 35, is not altogether convincing to me.

ušabārim: WB. Spiegel reads *dašabārim*, after Rawlinson and Benfey. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, preferred *usabārim . . . ašam*. For numerous older interpretations and views see Spiegel, Keilinschr.³ 92-93. Müller had two suggestions. The first, WZKM. I 220, was a comparison of Xenophon's Anabasis and the reading of *ašabārim*, where *aša* was to correspond to the Greek ἀσός. Later, WZKM. XI 252 seq., Müller changed his reading to *mašabārim*, and he compared Skt. *mēṣa*, Lith. *maišas*, Old Church Slav. *měxъ* 'hide.' Tolman, Transact. Wisconsin Acad. VIII 244, returns to the old reading *daša*^o and renders: 'One (army) I made submissive' (i. e. bearing my right hand). Rugarli does not attempt to translate the crux.

My own suggestion is to read for the (*u*)*ša-bārim* of WB. and Rawlinson's *daša-barim išu-bārim*. This I would render: 'one part I made archers' (cf. Skt. *iṣubhṛt*, which has this same signification). A division of the army into archers and cavalry would be very natural, especially in view of the importance of the former arm of the service (cf. Jackson, Herodotus, vii. 61, or Ancient Persian Armour, in Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler, particularly 100, 111-114). The objection may

be alleged that the *u* in *išu*^o is not found in the text. If, however, my reading *avājata* in §10 be accepted, a parallel instance of the complete omission of a letter is at hand.

A purely etymological reading *iša-bārim* would do no violence to the text. This might be rendered 'borne by swift (chariots),' which would give tolerable sense. For the semasiology of **iša* 'chariot' from *√iṣ* 'to hasten' one might compare Latin *currus* from *curro*, and for the passive sense of *bāri* the Ancient Persian *asabāri* 'horse-borne, knight.' This suggestion of *išabāri* I regard as much inferior to that of *išubāri*.¹

[Prof. Jackson suggests that WB.'s reading *uša-bārim* should be retained. He would render the word 'borne by oxen,' with a comparison of Skt. *ukṣan*, Av. *uxšan*. For this instance of Anc. Pers. *š* = Indog. *ks* we may perhaps compare Anc. Pers. *ustāšana* (Art. Pers. a 29) beside *hamataxšaiy*, Bh. i. 68, 70, and *hamatax-šatā*, Bh. iv. 65, 82. For the passive sense of *-bāri*, Anc. Pers. *asabāri* is to be compared. I have regarded Darius as lining up his forces for battle in this paragraph of the inscription, while Prof. Jackson thinks that the king is furnishing transportation across the Tigris for his troops. Prof. Jackson makes this suggestion with some hesitation, being fully aware of objections which he thinks may be alleged against it; but it has, in my judgment, much in its favor.]

as[pā]: WB. This seems to me to be the only tenable reading. Müller's reading, WZKM. I 222, XI 253, *tašma(kam) anayam* 'Flossbrücke,' from the root *taxš*, is fatally deficient as regards phonology. On the double form *aspa* and *asa* see above, under my discussion of *sp* in Ancient Persian.

§19, lines 90-96. Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Babylon. When I had not come to Babylon, there is a place, Zazāna by name, on the Euphrates. There that Nidintubel, who called himself Nebuchadrezzar, went against me with an army to make battle. Afterward we made battle. Ormazd brought me help. By the grace of Ormazd I killed the army of Nidintubel at will. The enemy plunged (?) in the water. The water bore him away. Of the month Anāmaka two days were in course. Then we made battle.

¹ I scarcely think that the similarity in form of the New Sus. *Anšu-a-ab-ba^{id}* and *Anšu-kur-ra^{id}* 'camel' and 'horse' (Weisbach, so also Foy, ZDMG. LII 593) can be any support of a rendering by 'chariot-borne' of *iša-bārim* (!).

[a]hq[*jat*]ā: While the meaning is tolerably clear, the text is very corrupt. WB.'s reading here must be connected with the Skt. root *sañj* 'hang.' Bartholomae, AF. I 61, took *āpiyā* as an instrumental and read as his verb-form *ahadatā* = Skt. *asahata* 'was overpowered by the water.' Foy, KZ. XXXV 36, would return to the reading of Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 239, *āhyatā* from *√ah* 'throw.' Müller, WZKM. I 222, suggested *aharpatā* (cf. Skt. *√sarp*), but this gives six letters when only five are allowed us in the lacuna in the inscription itself. Oppert's reading of *aharatā* (Skt. *√sar*), Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, 'in aquam fugit,' is exceedingly good, in my judgment. Either this *aharatā* or the *āhyatā* of Kern and Foy (adopted also by Rugarli, "il nemico fu gettato nell' acqua") is to be adopted. The New Sus. has here *pullana* 1. sg. aor. caus. to the root *pu* 'go,' cf. Foy, ZDMG. LII 580. The New Susian and the Ancient Persian do not, therefore, literally correspond here, Oppert, loc. cit.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

II.—THE TWO RECENSIONS OF PLAUTUS, *A* AND *P*^a.

Our manuscript evidence for Plautus consists in reality of two ancient texts. One of them, the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*), still exists in a fragmentary and often illegible condition; the other (*P*^a), the proto-archetype of all other existing MSS, disappeared in or about the tenth century. Shortly before the disappearance of *P*^a, at least two copies of it were made, both of which are now lost. The contents of part of one copy we know from that collation of the Codex Turnebi (*T*) which was recently discovered in the Bodleian Library; the contents of the other (*P*) we can infer from a comparison of its descendants, our existing minuscule MSS, *B*, *C*, *D*, etc. While *A* seems to have belonged to N. Italy, the home of *P*^a was apparently Central France. By a singular good fortune these two ancient texts represent two rival recensions or editions of our author.

The existence of discrepant versions of Plautus is only natural. His plays were revived on the stage some time after his death (cf. *Cas. prol.*); and stage-managers would inevitably find occasion to shorten one scene or lengthen another, or replace an old-fashioned word or phrase by its new equivalent. Side by side with this deterioration went the restorative labours of learned men like Aelius Stilo and Varro, who exerted themselves to discover the 'ipsa verba' of the ancient poet. In Festus' compendium of the Dictionary of Verrius Flaccus, a dictionary composed in the time of Augustus, four of the quotations from Plautus are cited in a double form—one form, we may surmise, being the actual composition of Plautus, while the other is the alteration of some stage-manager. The Grammarian Charisius, who lived about the time when *A* (perhaps also *P*^a) was published, speaking of a passage in the *Bacchides* (v. 545), says 'it is not found in some copies' (in quibusdam non ferunt). If one applied for a copy of Plautus from a bookseller of, let us say, the fourth century A. D., one would, I fancy, have to specify which edition was wanted, just as nowadays one might select either the 'actor's' edition or the 'student's' edition of Shakspeare. Under the conditions that regulated the publishing of books in the ancient world, it would

be impossible for these separate editions to retain in full their different characteristics; for the setting of a verse in one recension would often be entered as a variant in the margin of a copy of the other recension; and when a transcription came to be made of the volume, these marginal (or interlinear) adscripts would often find their way into the text, producing 'mixed' versions. Aulus Gellius in his gossip about the books and booksellers of his time makes allusion to such a state of things. He mentions, for example (Noct. Att. IX 14), that in copies of the History of Claudius Quadrigarius he found the genitive form *facies* with *facii* added in the margin (sed '*facies*' in ordinem scriptum fuit, et contra per i geminum '*facii*').

Our two survivals (if we may include *P^a* under this designation) from the vast number of copies of Plautus in the ancient Roman world—one of them, as we have seen, a publication of N. Italy, the other of Central France—shew, both of them, traces of this 'mixture' of text. In the main they are representatives of two distinct recensions. Thus *A*, in whose extant fragments three of the four passages are preserved, which Festus cites in divergent form, exhibits in each of the three the one variant mentioned by Festus, while *P^a* exhibits the other: the Bacchides passage specified by Charisius is omitted in *A*, but is present in *P^a*; and we may congratulate ourselves on the extraordinary good-nature of Fortune which has determined that, although only two ancient texts have been transmitted to us, these two should represent the two rival forms in which the text of Plautus seems to have been presented to the ancient world. But, as an example or two will shew, it would be a mistake to regard our two survivals as if they were two standard copies, such as might be preserved in a national library as perfect specimens of the rival recensions. In Pseud. 864 one recension ended the line with *conquiniscito*, the other with *ceucto simul* (a reading preserved for us by Nonius). *Conquiniscito* is the reading of *A*, but in *P^a* we find the unmetrical ending *conquiniscito simul*:

si cónquiniscet istic, cónquiniscito simul.

The reading of the other recension had been written above the line:

conquiniscito
si conquiniscet istic, ceucto simul,

and had been mistaken by a transcriber for a correction of the word *ceucto*. Similarly in Pseud. 392 the rival versions were:

ex multis, exquire ex illis unum qui certus siet (*P^A*),

and

ex multis, ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo.

The latter version was that of the archetype of *A*. But the intrusion of the variant *al(ias) exquire ex illis* into some copy has produced this 'mixed' version in *A*:

ex multis atque exquire ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo.

In these two examples the reading of the rival recension has only blurred, not wholly effaced, the original version. But in Pseud. 955 only one of the rival versions appears in our two texts:

nón prorsus, uerum éx transuerso cédit, quasi cancér solet,

the other, apparently the genuine form, would have been lost to us, had it not been for a citation by Varro (L. L. VII 81):

út transuersus, nón prouersus, cédit, quasi cancér solet.

We must therefore see in *A* and *P^A* copies indeed, but only 'blurred' copies, of two distinct recensions of Plautus.

Another cause that has confused their outlines is the inevitable tendency of scribes to make mistakes. The immediate original of *A* has, we may be sure, by no means been faithfully transcribed in *A* itself, and the remote archetype of *A* is still less faithfully reproduced. The case of *P^A* is even worse. In the parts for which we have not the evidence of *T*, all that we can appeal to is the testimony of *P*; and who can say how many errors have been made by the mediaeval German monk (or monks) who transcribed *P*? Could we discover *P^A*, we should certainly find that in scores of passages it had identically the same text as *A*, where our MSS—*B*, *C*, *D*, etc.—all exhibit a divergent reading, a reading that originated in the carelessness of the scribe of *P*. Here are some examples which the newly found collation of *T* has revealed to us: Pers. 536 *mihi* *AP^A*, om. *P*; 629 *eueniant* *AP^A*, *conueniant* *P*; Poen. 310 *quia* *AP^A*, *qui* *P*; 472 *quom* *AP^A*, *quo* *P*; 860 *dignus qui siet* *AP^A*, om. *P*; 977 *punicast guggast homo* *AP^A*, om. *P*; 1019 *tu aliud sapis* *AP^A*, *tua* *P*; 1036 *tu* *P*, om. *AP^A*; 1204 *addunt* *AP^A*, om. *P*. And on the other hand a great deal of the apparent harmony of *A* with our minuscule MSS is equally specious. In Pseud. 1326 the mistake of *reddi* for *redi* is found in *A*. It did not appear in *P^A*, nor yet in *P*, but it intruded itself into that transcript of *P* which was the original of our MSS, *C* and *D*. In Trin. 530 the same mistake, *reddit* for *redit*, is

found in *A* and in *P*. But how can we be sure that it was also found in *P*^A and did not first intrude itself into that transcript of *P*^A which we call *P*? Errors of this kind are at all times a temptation to a scribe, and there is every possibility that the scribe of *A* and the scribe of some text of the other recension fell into them independently. We have therefore no right to take for granted, as is generally done, that *A* and *P*^A exhibited a 'consensus' in such errors as Trin. 773 *gererem* for *gerere rem*, Pseud. 98 *libellae* for *libellai*, Poen. 876 *resistam* for *res sistam*, 669 *accurres* for *accures*. It is extraordinary how many writers on the subject of the two recensions of Plautus have assumed that, because natural miswritings like these are found in our extant minuscule MSS, they must have been present in *P*^A, and even, a still more dangerous inference, that their presence in *A* proves that they existed in some imaginary original from which both *A* and *P*^A were derived. A much less natural miswriting, *hamum* for *hamulum*, has been made in Stich. 289 independently by the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and by the scribe of *A* (or the original of *A*). The reading of *P*^A and of *P* (as of *B*) was *hamulum*. Had *B* not retained the true form, we should have imagined that *hamum* was the reading of *P* and of *P*^A (cf. Pers. 572 *anulum* for *anellum*). The discovery of the collation of *T* has opened our eyes to the number of errors introduced into the text for the first time by the scribe of *P*. Great care, therefore, is necessary in compiling a list of the passages in which *A* and *P*^A exhibit either on the one hand a divergence of reading, or on the other a 'consensus' in error. And even when we have clear evidence for the reading of *A* and *P*^A, we have still to assure ourselves whether *A* and *P*^A in this respect offer a faithful or a blurred reflection of the two rival recensions from which they have sprung.

The problem, therefore, of reconstructing the two ancient recensions of Plautus is as difficult as it is fascinating. The more ancient and therefore presumably genuine form is the reading of *A* in a large number of passages, e. g. Pseud. 432 *fors fuat an istaec A, forsitan ea tibi P*; Trin. 88 *quid siet A, quicquid est P*; Pseud. 315 *meliora faxint and face A, melius faciant and fac hoc P*; Truc. 197 *opperimino A, opperire ibi P*. But not always, e. g. Trin. 328 *nisi tu nonuis A, si tu non neuis P* (unless the *A*-reading is a corruption of *nisi tu noenu uis*). Truc. 375 *rei pepercisses A, rei item parsisses P* (Spengel proposed *repercisses*

as the true reading and the reading in the original of *A*). In Trin. 70, *A* preserves the old form *obiurgem*, which in *P* shews a questionable 'modernized' form, designed to save the metre, *obiurgilem*; but in v. 68 it is *A* which has *obiurgilem*, while *P* has *obiurgem*. A curious variation is Stich. 586 *sustentatum est A, sustentauit P*; Truc. 369 *ambulatamst A, ambulasti P*. Interesting, too, is Truc. 245 *demum oggerunt A, demus danunt P*. In Poen. 343 the apparently unmetrical ending of *A* seems to be a concession to decorum. There is an alternative passage in iambic senarii to take the place of the lyric canticum at the beginning of the Stichus in *P*, but not in *A*.

The newly found collation of *T* has thrown a good deal of light on the arrangement of the cantica in *P^A*; for *T* retained the line-division of *P^A*, while *P* often departed from it by writing two short lines as one, for the sake of saving space. We now know that *P^A* exhibited the same method of colometry as *A*, the longest lines beginning at the extreme left-hand margin of the page (ἐν ἐκθέσει), the shortest near the middle of the page (ἐν εὐθέσει). This method is often followed nowadays in printed texts of the Latin and Greek dramatists, and is not so remote from our usage as the practice, already mentioned, of inserting variant readings in the margin or between the lines; whereas in our books they are printed at the bottom of the page. Another kind of marginal adscript, equally productive of error, was employed for the sake of indicating that this or that passage might or should be omitted in acting the play. The method of indicating this seems to have been to adscribe at the beginning of the passage the line or lines which immediately follow the passage and which were themselves rewritten at their proper place. This extraordinary practice has, as may be imagined, led to great confusion. Thus in Trin. 361 sqq., where Lysiteles is talking with his father, Philto:

LYS. Ne opprobra, pater; multa eueniunt homini quae uolt, quae neuolt.

PHIL. Mentire edepol, gnate, atque id nunc facis haud consuetudine.

nam sapiens quidem pol ipse fingit fortunam sibi:

eo non multa quae neuolt eueniunt, nisi fictor malust.

LYS. Multa illi opera opust ficturae, qui se fictorem probum

365

uitae agundae esse expetit: sed hic admodum adolescentulust.

PHIL. Non aetate, uerum ingenio apiscitur sapientia;

sapienti aetas condimentum, sapiens aetati cibust.

agedum eloquere, quid dare illi nunc uis? LYS. Nil quicquam, pater,

the possibility of omitting vv. 362-368 appears to have been

indicated in this or some similar fashion, with the result that in *A* v. 369 and in *P*⁴ both this line and its neighbour have been transposed to the place of v. 362. Strictly speaking, it would be natural to find the passage in one recension retained and in the other omitted; so that these marginal indications of feasible omission are perhaps due to 'mixture' of recensions. In the last scene of the *Captivi* the single line (v. 1023)

nunc edepol demum in memoriam régregiōr audisse me (A)

was in the other recension supplanted by a passage of seven lines (vv. 1016-22), ending with

nunc demum in memoriā redeo, cum mecum recógito;

and that the single-line version is the older and more genuine may be inferred from the old scansion *regrediōr* which it contains. Here too there is a trace of 'mixture'; for in *P* this older line appears in the text at the conclusion of the alternative passage, so that we have the meaningless repetition:

nunc demum in memoriam redeo, cum mecum recogito,
nunc edepol demum in memoriam regredior, audisse me
quasi per nebulam, Hegionem meum patrem uocari.

(Omission of a passage through homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton must not be assigned to a difference of recension, e. g. *Epid.* 597-9 *om. A.*)

Besides divergence of words, phrases, and whole passages, there are other points of distinction between the two recensions. Often one arrangement of a canticum appears in one recension and a different arrangement in the other. *Pseud.* 1329 sq., for example, are in *A* treated as a long bacchiac series, but in *P*⁴ as a bacchiac trimeter catalectic followed by a long cretic series. There are other instances; and the list would no doubt be larger, if we had sure evidence (as supplied by *T* in the *Pseudolus*, *Poenulus*, *Persa* and *Rudens*) for the arrangement of the cantica throughout *P*⁴. 'Mixture' of colometry is scarcely conceivable. The colometry of one recension might oust the colometry of the other, but could hardly be notified in the margin in the way that a variant reading or an alternative passage was indicated.

Again, the order of the plays was different. The order in the recension followed by *A* we do not know in the case of the first three plays. For the rest it was: *Bacch.*, *Capt.*, *Curc.*, *Cas.*, *Cist.*, *Epid.*, *Merc.*, *Most.*, *Mil.*, *Men.*, *Trin.*, *Truc.*, *Vid.*, *Poen.*, *Pers.*,

Pseud., Rud., Stich. The order in the other recension was: Amph., Asin., Aul., Bacch., Capt., Curc., Cas., Cist., Epid., Most., Men., Mil., Merc., Pseud., Poen., Pers., Rud., Stich., Trin., Truc., Vid. In *P* the Bacchides, in which play (v. 214) there is a mention of the Epidicus:

etiam Epidicum, quam ego fabulam aequae ac me ipsum amo,
nullam aequae inuitus specto, si agit Pello,

was put after the Epidicus; but that in the archetype it stood after the Aulularia is shewn by the gap at the end of the one play (Aul. 832-fin.) and at the beginning of the other. The transposition may be due to some learned Carolingian abbot, under whose direction a transcript was made from *P*⁴. Whether the curious position of the Trinummus, Truculentus and Vidularia in *A* should be attributed to the recension of which *A* is a copy or to the mistake of a transcriber¹ is not clear.

There is also a difference of scene-headings; but how far precisely the divergences may be traced past *A* and *P*⁴ to the rival recensions themselves is difficult to decide, partly because of the imperfect state of these headings in the Ambrosian Palimpsest in its present condition, partly because of an accident which interrupted the transmission of them in copies of the other recension (see Prescott, in Harvard Studies, vol. XI).

Nor should we lay too much stress on the presence of the didascaliae in *A* and their absence from *P*⁴, nor yet on the absence from *A* (in its original form) of the arguments. There were two series of arguments for the plays, one series being acrostic; but we have hardly the right to assume that the one or the other series was a characteristic of the one or the other recension. The arguments are, of course, late compositions.

Now that we have full knowledge of the contents and form of *A*—thanks to Studemund's Apograph (Weidmann, Berlin, 1889)—and now that the newly found collation of *T* has thrown light on the contents and form of *P*⁴, it is to be hoped that some one will undertake the task of reconstructing, so far as is possible, the ancient rival recensions of which these codices are representatives. The monographs of Niemeyer, *De Plauti fabularum recensione*

¹ Not of a binder; for at the end of the Menaechmi we read

T. [MACCI PLA]VTI
MENAECMI EXP[L.] INC. TRINVMVS
FELICITER

duplici (Berlin, 1877), and Baier, *De Plauti fabularum recensio-nibus Ambrosiana et Palatina* (Breslau, 1885), were written before this knowledge of *A* and *P^A* was available. The full information, too, that Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* now provides regarding the glossaries or ancient dictionaries will facilitate the detection of readings in *A* or *P^A* which are rather errors of transcription, due to the substitution of a suprascript gloss for the actual word of the text, than varieties of reading. *Rogo*, for example, is the stock explanation of O.Lat. *oro* in the dictionaries of the Empire; and so *rogas*, the reading of *A* in Most. 682 (cf. *P^A* in Pers. 321):

bonum aequomque oras,

is not to be attributed to the recension which *A* embodies, but merely to the error of a scribe who found in his original

^{rogas}
bonum aequomque oras

and miscopied it as

bonum aequomque rogas.

Totus is similarly the stock explanation of O.Lat. *perpes*; and so *totam* was in some original of *A* written above *perpetem* (-im) in Truc. 278:

noctem in stramentis pernoctare perpetim.

The transcriber mistook the suprascript word, not for a correction (as in the line of the *Mostellaria* just quoted), but for an omission, producing in *A* the unmetrical line

noctem in stramentis pernoctare perpetim totam.

Care will be needed for the removal of such variants from the list of divergent readings of the rival recensions, and, on the other hand, in detecting a 'consensus' in error of *A* and *P^A* that has arisen through the same cause. In Poen. 1317, for example, *cur non*, the reading of *A* and of *P*, may not be the original reading of either recension, but may have found its way at different times into *A* (or some original) and *P^A* (or some original) through the suprascription of the gloss *cur non* over the word of the text, *quin*. Among other passages that may be mentioned in this connexion are: Merc. 300 *benest* *A*, *bonum est* *P*; 314 *plane decrepitus* *A*, *vetulus decrepitus* *P* (cf. Epid. 666); Pers. 408 *periure* *A*, *iniure* *P^A*; Pseud. 43 *impertit* *A*, *mittit* *P*; 232 *nihil curassis* *A*, *bene curassis* (if miswritten for *ne curassis*) *P*; 397 *neque paratust quicquam* *A*, *neque parata gutta* *P*; 417 *ante-*

ueniat A, *antecedat* P; 901 *fortiter* A, *firmiter* P^A; 1142 *ipsus ipsum* A, *ipsus coram* P; Stich. 455 *logis* A, *meis* P; 523 *ubi* A, *si* P; Trin. 1071 *hic* A, *ipsus* P; Truc. 260 *in nostra domo* A, *nostrae domi* P; 363 *puer* A, *mihi* P. Cas. 702 is an instructive example of how glosses marred the two texts:

ut núbat mihi—illud quidéu uolebám,
nostró uilicó;

for the peculiar phrase *illud quidem uolebam*, 'I meant to say,' has brought glosses, but, fortunately, different glosses, into *A* (*dicere uolebam*) and *P* (*uolebam non sed*). In Mil. 599 the single gloss *auribus* seems to have occasioned the extra line in *P*.

A still more difficult task will be to determine what divergences of reading are due merely to faulty transcription of a scribe and are not to be referred to the ancient recensions themselves. The scribe of *P*, for example, when pressed for space seems to have followed a practice, unfortunately too common in early minuscule writing, of omitting the final syllable of a word and indicating the omission by a horizontal stroke above. A divergence of reading between *A* and our minuscule MSS that consists merely of difference of termination is often liable to suspicion on this account, e. g. Epid. 224 *facimus* A, *faciunt* BVEJ, where *P* may have had *faci* (i. e. *facimus*). Again, divergences like Stich. 435, *hasce* A, *eas* P, may not be real divergences of the ancient recensions. Both may have had *hasce*, but at some time or other in the transmission of the 'Palatine' text a scribe may have miscopied the unfamiliar word as *eas*. A careful estimate of the possibility and probability of faulty transcription by ancient or mediaeval scribes will greatly reduce the list of apparent divergences of reading in the two recensions. It will also diminish the examples of 'consensus' in error. The besetting sins of scribes of all periods, such as the 'modernizing' of archaic forms, haplography, etc., have been already mentioned; and a little study of the critical apparatus of the large Teubner edition of Plautus will convince us how inevitable are such corruptions as *eueniat* for *euenat* (Trin. 41), *ut* for *uti* (Stich. 193 and passim), *possum* for *potis (pote) sum* (Pseud. 355), *opinor* for *opino* (Bacch. 487 and passim), *illi* (dat.) for *illic* (Mil. 351, etc.), besides *illic* (adv.) for *illi, illum* for *illunc* (Poen. 1302, etc.), *-ae* (gen.) for *-ai* (Pseud. 98, etc.), as well as misspellings like *habeas* for *abeas* (Pseud. 393), *scimus* for *simus* (Pseud. 683), *honestam* for *onustam* (Pseud. 1306), *hostium* for *ostium* (Most. 768). The newly found evidence of *T*

shews us how often such errors originated in *P* and were not found in *P*⁴, even when they appear in *A* [e. g. Pers. 442 *quum* (*qum*) *PA*, *quin AP*]. Similarly, the evidence of *B* shews us when they are to be referred to the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and not to the scribe of *P* (e. g. Trin. 371 *tolerabilis ACD*, *tolerabis P*; Mil. 374 *mihi possunt ACD*, *possunt mihi P*). No argument whatever regarding the ancient recensions can be based on 'consensus' in errors of this description, even though such 'consensus' could be established for *A* and *P*⁴. In Poen. 365 we have the express testimony of Nonius and Gellius that Plautus wrote *mea delicia*. This O.Lat. unfamiliar form appears in the familiar guise *meae deliciae* in *A* and *P*⁴; but it would be rash to assert that *meae deliciae* was the deliberate reading of the editor of one or other (or both) of the rival recensions, and not a mere mistake committed separately by transcribers of the text.

Other possibilities of specious, not real, 'consensus' in error are more difficult to determine. In Truc. 227 the alliteration of neighbouring words, which always furnishes a handle for transposition, has misled both the scribe of *A* and the scribe of *P*. The line runs:

meretricem similem sentis esse cōdecet,

but *A* offers *sentis similem esse* and *P* had *esse similem sentis*. Both scribes have made the same mistake of transposition, but, fortunately, their deviation from their original has taken different directions. All the same, there was an even chance of a 'consensus' in error whose accidental nature might have passed undetected. Similarly in Truc. 383:

quod tu hīc me absente nōui negoti gēsseris?

A's transposition is *me hīc absente*, while *P*'s is *hīc absente me*. Although there was no alliteration in this phrase to tempt to transposition, this error has been made independently by both scribes, but, fortunately, in different forms. In Men. 201:

Hércules haud aēque magno umquam ábstulit pérículo,

the alliterative words have been transposed in the same way in both *A* and *P*, *haud Hercules*. But can we be sure that the error has not been made independently in the one text and in the other? Festus quotes the words in their proper order. In Mil. 727-9:

sicut merci prētium statuit quī est probus agoránomus:
quae probast mers, prētium ei statuit, pró uirtute ut uéneat,
quae improbast, pro mércis uitio dóminum pretio paúperat,

the similarity of the clauses led to omission, but, fortunately, not to the same omission, in *P* (*om. qui est—statuit*) and in *A* (*om. mers—improbast*). Like examples are *Poen.* 389 sqq., and apparently *Stich.* 262, etc. But the most irresistible of all temptations to a scribe was the temptation to haplography, to write a repeated word or syllable once instead of twice. It would hardly be rash to assert that there is not a repeated word or syllable in a line of Plautus which in some MS or other has not come to suffer haplography. If Plautus wrote:

Pseud. 443 'Ω *Zeū, Zeū, quam pauci éstis homines cómmodi*!,
Stich. 384 *iám, iam non facio aúctionem: mi óbtigit heréditas,*
Poen. 1272 *cur, cúr numero estis mórtui, hoc exémplo ut pingerétis?*,
 969 *cretást, cretast profécto horum hominum orátio,*

we have no right to ascribe the haplography in *A* and *P* or *P^A* (*Zeū, iam, cur, cretast*) to a common original of *A* and *P^A*. Such a mistake would with the utmost ease be made independently by different scribes.

Of late there has been a tendency to minimize the indications of different origin of *A* and *P^A*, although these indications are so strong and unmistakable—difference of text, difference in arrangement of cantica, difference in the order of the plays. Cases of 'mixture' of text have been put forward as a proof that both recensions came from some original 'variorum' edition of the collected plays, an edition crammed with variant readings; and the divergence of the two recensions is referred to the choice by transcribers, now of the reading of the text, now of the marginal variant. It seems to me that the account given above—viz. that the reading of one recension came in course of time to be entered in the margin of the other recension, and from there found its way into the text—is a much more natural and likely explanation. In fact, we can trace the same process still going on in *A* and in *P^A* themselves (or their originals). In *Pseud.* 1207, *impium*, the reading of *P^A*, is entered in the margin of *A*, whose reading is *impurum*, while in *Pseud.* 880 what was a marginal (or interlinear) variant in the original has retained a place, but not its right place, in *A* (*tu illos P^A* and A-text, *tuos* A-margin). In *Pseud.* 1207 *abduceret*, the reading of *A*, is entered in the margin of *P^A*, whose reading is *arcesseret*, and so on. A study of the divergent readings of *A* and *P^A* leaves the impression rather of two different editions which had in many passages been assimilated through

the adoption by one of some readings of the other, than of two copies of the same edition which were beginning to exhibit points of dissimilarity. And yet some advocates of unity of origin for the two codices go so far as to ascribe certain apparent instances of 'consensus' in error to the existence of holes in the pages of this supposed original, and to estimate the number of lines which each imaginary page must have contained. This is surely to forget that *A* and *P*^A are two out of a vast number of ancient copies of Plautus, belonging to different parts of the Roman world, with as much likelihood of being related to each other as two copies of Shakspeare, published, let us say, at the interval of a century or half a century, the one at Glasgow and the other at Melbourne. The great argument used by the supporters of such theories is the 'consensus' in error of the two ancient codices. They confront us with an imposing list of lines in which the reading of *A* and of *P*^A is the same, and apparently erroneous. Year by year these lists grow smaller; for, as our knowledge of Plautine diction and prosody grows, we recognize the correctness of this or that reading supported by the 'consensus' of *A* and *P*^A. Before 1892, when Prof. Skutsch published the first volume of his *Forschungen*, with its interesting discovery of the suppression of final *ē* in *ille*, *nempe*, *inde*, *proinde*, etc., in Plautus' verse, just as in all literature in *atque* (*ac*), *neque* (*nec*), *neue* (*neu*), lines like Stich. 175:

quia inde iam á pausillo púero ridiculús fui

used to form a considerable part of these lists. Rud. 538 will, I presume, be omitted from them, now that Prof. Skutsch has shewn us that *auderem* has its old pronunciation *aviderem*:

Qui? Quia auderem técum in nauem ascéndere.

The whole history of Plautine textual criticism in recent years has taught us that truth lies, if anywhere, in the 'consensus' of *A* and *P*^A, and that the danger in tampering with a reading supported by *A* alone or *P* (or *P*^A) alone is not nearly so great as the danger of discarding the combined testimony of the 'two witnesses.' No judge will arrive at a correct verdict who does not weigh the evidence. The evidence of *AP*^A must outweigh the single evidence of *P*. The practice of emending lines of Plautus without stating whether the reading which is impugned rests on the authority of *P* only, or of *P*^A only, or of *A* only, or of *A* and *P*^A combined, obscures the conditions of the problem

to the reader and encourages the writer to reject genuine readings too hastily. The whole weight of tradition supports the reading *penitus* (in its original sense of 'from inside') in Pseud. 132:

atque ipse egreditur pénitus (*intus* edd.), periuri caput.

Are we as much justified in substituting *intus* in this line as we might be in a line for which we had no better evidence than the Carolingian MS *P*? In Stich. 704, does not the 'consensus' of *AP* in the reading *in lecticis* rather point to some Plautine coinage like *inlectice* (adv.) of the type of *accubuo* (Truc. 422)?

STICH. Nímium lepide in méntem uenit: pótius quam in subséllio
Cýnice hic accipimúr quam inlectice (*in lectis* edd.). SAG. Immo enim nimio
hic dúlcus.

Must we not retain their reading *stultitiis* in Trin. 509, and give *de* the sense of 'after' or 'in consequence of' (as in Cas. 415, etc.)?

nám is (*sc. ager*) de stultitiis (*diuitiis* edd.) meis
solús superfit praéter uitam rélicuos.

Should we disregard their testimony to the old trisyllabic form of *ergo* adv. (as *iurigo* of *iurgo*, *purigo* of *purgo*) in Poen. 1051?

patrítus er<i>go hóspes Antidamás fuit?

Should we ignore their indication of an O.Lat. *fortasse est* like *necesse est* in Poen. 1004-5?

MIL. Fortásse medicos nós esse arbitrárier.

AGOR. Si ést (Si ita est edd.), nega esse: nólo ego errare hóspitem.

And is the phrase *in ius uos uolo* so impossible that we must suppose both *A* and *P^A* to be in error in Poen. 1225?

quíd istic? quod faciúndumst cur non ágimús? in ius uós uolo (*uoco* edd.).

Certainly, if we consider the number of lines supported by the 'consensus' of *A* and *P^A*, whose reading has been justified through advance in our knowledge of Plautus, we shall be inclined to predict that nearly every line so supported will prove to be free from error, unless there be an error into which *A* and *P^A* have fallen independently, like the 'modernizing' of an archaic form, e. g. *ridiculisissimos* for *ridiculissimos* (Stich. 389), haplography, or some other equally obvious miswriting, such as *illorum* for *Iliorum* (Bacch. 951), *atque euoca* for *atque uoca* (Poen. 1116), *Euolaticorum* for *E* (the 'nota personae') *uolaticorum* (Poen. 474), *optumi maxumi* for *opt. maxume* (Men. 574), *festiua mulier* for

festiuam mulier (Mil. 591). But to argue on the other side is much more easy, for one has ready to hand all the apparent instances of 'consensus' in error which have not yet received their explanation; and, although the number available is diminishing steadily, there still remains a sufficient quantity to provide a respectable case. A large list of instances is furnished by lines which shew hiatus. These, however, lose their force, if we are to believe (and I do not see how we can venture to disbelieve) Cicero's express statement that the early poets made extensive use of this license. To discuss the limits within which we may suppose Plautus to have used it would, however, take too much space here.¹

Even if real cases of 'consensus' in error, these lines with hiatus would hardly justify the theory of so close a relation between *A* and *P^A* as is assumed. Prof. Leo has shewn the likelihood that in the early Empire unrestricted hiatus was believed to be a feature of Plautine verse, and that a 'versus hians' would be accepted without question by all editors of Plautus. The strongest argument that has been produced in favour of the close relation of *A* and *P^A* is the appearance at Merc. 598 of two lines which belong to another part of the play (vv. 842-3). In *P^A* the passage stood so:

(CHAR.)	sed isne est, quem currentem uideo? ipso est, ibo obuiam.	598
EVY.	Diuom atque hominum quae spectatrix atque era eadem es	
	hominibus,	842
	spem speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates ago.	843
CHAR.	Nunc, quod restat, ei disperii: uoltus nequitiam huius placet;	599
	tristis incedit,—pectus ardet, haereo,—quassat caput.	600
Eutyche.	EVY. Eu, Charine. CHAR. Priusquam recipias anhelitum,	601

In *A* only the beginnings of the lines are legible. First comes a line beginning *sed isne* (v. 598), then a line (too long to be written in a single verse) beginning *di*—, then a line beginning *spes*, then a line beginning *nuncq*—, then a line beginning *se . . . q*—, then a line beginning *tr*—, then either one or two lines (perhaps a scene-heading) of which not a single letter can be read, then a line beginning *Eutyche* and ending *quam recipi[as] anhelitum*. The lines (vv. 842-3)

diuom atque hominum quae spectatrix atque era eadem es hominibus,
spem speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates ago

¹ I have attempted to do so elsewhere, in the English Journal of Philology for this year.

are suitable in the place where they appear later in the play, after v. 841 (the leaves of *A* which contained this part of the play have been lost). There Eutychus reappears on the stage, charged with joyful tidings,—not, as here, with a message of sorrow;—and it is argued that by some extraordinary mistake a scribe entered them in the margin or inserted them in the text at this place, and did not take the trouble to erase them. From a text marred by this blunder, it is said, both *P^A* and *A* have been transcribed. Another explanation is possible—namely, that Eutychus, at his two appearances on the stage with his two messages, had much the same form of words put into his mouth by the dramatist, and that in *P^A* his utterance at his first appearance was by a blunder assimilated to his second utterance. If we could recover the rest of the two lines in *A*, they would, on this theory, exhibit their correct form. I do not think this piece of evidence for a close connexion of *A* and *P^A* is strong enough to overcome the mass of facts that speak against this connexion. And it is, so far as I know, the strongest piece of evidence that has yet been alleged.¹

W. M. LINDSAY.

¹ Poen. 1168 seems to be correctly preserved by *A* and (in the main) by *P^A*. *In* has the sense of 'like, after the fashion of':

AGOR. Sed eccās uideo ipsas. HAN. Haécine meae sunt filiae?
quantae é quantillis iám sunt factae! AGOR. Scín quid est?
Thraecae sunt; in celónem (*sunt celumne P^A*) sustollí solent.

On Mil. 1419, Stich. 620 see Seyffert in Berl. Phil. Woch. XVI (1896), p. 234. In Poen. 331, why may not *insecundo* (cf. Auct. ad Herenn. IV 56) be formed from *insequor* in the same way as *secundo* from *sequor*? In Cas. 571 *prius* is the original scansion of the word, and *contor*, the simple verb of which *percontor* is a compound, is by no means impossible; in Stich. 223 *Hercúlès te amabit* is a most natural parenthetical exclamation to an imaginary bidder; in v. 243 of the same play *eu ecastor* seems to be 'extra metrum,' like *attat* in Cas. 619 (cf. Mar. Vict. 85); in Pseud. 306 *iustus* need not be altered, nor in v. 442 *idné tú*; in Mil. 254 *quae mentibitur* has the same construction as Ennius' *uitam uiuitur* (where *uitam* can not be acc. of time).

III.—CHRONOLOGICAL STUDIES IN THE GREEK TRAGIC AND COMIC POETS.

Surprisingly little progress has been made since the first half of the present century in clearing up the dark points in the chronology of the minor Greek tragic and comic poets. This fact is at once a tribute to the epoch-making work of Clinton, Meineke, and Welcker, who all possessed in a remarkable degree the combination of wide learning and critical acumen necessary for the several important tasks to which they addressed themselves, and a testimony to the inadequate and often corrupt character of the available chronological data with which later scholars have had to be content. It is safe to say that practically all has been done that can be done in the way of new combinations of the old material, and not always to the advantage of our science. If one will but take the pains to glance at the current and the older handbooks under the names of the poets whom we propose to discuss, one will find abundant illustrations of how opinion has periodically swayed first away from the conclusions reached by the scholars above mentioned, then back again to them, the same ancient notices doing duty in either case. In the scholarly and well-balanced articles from the pens of Kaibel and Dieterich which are now appearing in the Pauly-Wissowa Encyclopädie we generally find a complete survey of all the data, and conclusions which, on the whole, are not assailable in the present state of our knowledge. If I shall take issue with any of these conclusions it will be, with possibly one exception, because of evidence which has hitherto not been applied to these questions. On any other grounds it would neither be profitable nor justifiable to attempt to reopen the discussion for the sake merely of recording a personal opinion.

The new evidence to which I allude is to be found, for the most part, in the catalogues of victorious tragic and comic poets which I discussed in a recent number of this Journal, now found together under No. 977 of the second volume of the Attic Corpus. The order in which the names occur in these catalogues was determined by the date of the first victory of each poet. If, then, we

can fix the date of any given name in the lists, we shall know within very narrow limits the dates of the first victories of the poets immediately succeeding and following, and if we can fix the date of any two names in a given list, the limits are known within which the intervening names must fall. With the information thus gained we may hope in some cases to be able to correct or correctly interpret the often vague or corrupt chronological notices found in Suidas, the hypotheses prefixed to the extant dramas, Eusebius and the other chronographers, Anonymous *περὶ κωμῳδίας* II (Kaibel), the Parian Chronicle, and the statements scattered throughout Greek literature. This has not yet been attempted except in a desultory way and where the conclusions are most obvious; nor could it have been done satisfactorily, in the case of the comic poets, so long as the faulty classification given in the Corpus obtained. I propose to apply the new information thus derived mainly to some of the better known of the minor poets. The results which we shall reach may not always seem conclusive; it is hoped that they may at least be of value in suggesting a new line of inquiry or in giving a new point of view.

Theodectas.—Suidas furnishes almost all of the data which we possess concerning this poet: Θεοδέκτης Ἀριστάνδρου, Φασηλίτης ἐκ Λυκίας, ῥήτωρ, τραπέζης δὲ ἐπὶ τραγωδίας, μαθητὴς Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἰσοκράτους καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους. . . . ἐπὶ τῆς ρζ' (MSS ργ'; *corr.* Clinton) Ὀλυμπιάδος εἶπον (i. e. Theodectas, Naucrates, Isocrates, and Theopompus) ἐπιτάφιον ἐπὶ Μανσώλῳ. . . . δράματα δὲ ἐδίδαξε ν'. τελευτᾷ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐτῶν α' καὶ μ', ἔτι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ περιόντος. Welcker (*Die griech. Trag.*, p. 1070) finds a *terminus ante quem* for his death in the story of Alexander's homage to the poet's statue at Phaselis (Plut., *Alex.* 17). This was in 334/3. Since Theodectas was 41 years old at the time of his death, he must have been born as early at least as 375, probably a few years earlier. This result has been universally accepted, being consistent with the statement of Suidas that Theodectas was a pupil of Aristotle, who came to Athens in 368, and accounting for the marked respect shown by Alexander, who became the pupil of Aristotle in 343. The young prince may even have known the poet personally.

But the victors' catalogue upsets this most reasonable combination. In frag. *δ* we find [Καρκί]νος ΔΙ, [Ἄστ]υδάμας Π[Ι]Ι, [Θεο]δέκτας ΠΙΙ, [Ἀφα]ρεὺς ΙΙ. According to Vit. X Orat. 839 *d*, Aphareus began to exhibit in the archonship of Lysistratus, 368/7, and

appeared last in the archonship of Sosigenes, 342/1, winning two victories at the City Dionysia in this period. The acme of Carcinus is placed by Suidas in Ol. 100 (380-77). We learn from Diod. Sic. 5, 5 that he was often in Syracuse during the reign of the younger Dionysius (368 to 356). He must have attained a high position as a tragic poet before he was invited to Syracuse, and probably had won the larger number of his eleven victories before the accession of Dionysius II. The date of the first victory of Astydamas is fixed by the Parian Chronicle in the year 372, as we shall see later. The order of the names Carcinus, Astydamas, and Aphareus is therefore entirely in harmony with the chronological data. If we should assume an interval of three years between each of these four names—and certainly this is a liberal estimate—we should have as approximate dates of the first victories: Carcinus, ca. 376; Astydamas, 372; Theodectas, ca. 368; Aphareus, ca. 362. Since the acme of Carcinus is given as 380-77, it is more probable that his first victory was won before 376 than that Theodectas won later than 368. However, in order to keep as near to Suidas as possible, let us set the first victory of Theodectas forward to 365, though so long an interval is intrinsically improbable.

Theodectas produced 50 tragedies—that is, took part in more than 16 contests. That he devoted himself more especially to the City Dionysia is a fair inference from the fact that seven of his eight victories (Epigram apud Steph. Byz., s. v. *Φασηλίας*) were won at this festival. By all accounts he had gained an enviable reputation as a rhetor before he turned his attention to tragedy. His talents must have been recognized at an early age. And yet he could hardly have entered upon his career as a poet before the age of 25. To assume a later date would make it necessary to crowd more than three tragedies into each year. Accepting this age for his first appearance at the Dionysia, and assuming that he was victorious in his first competition, his death would fall ca. 350. If he was not successful at once, his death must be placed still earlier—a supposition that is excluded by the fact of his participation in the Mausolus competition in 351. On the other hand, even if nine years elapsed between the first victory of Astydamas and that of Theodectas, and even if the latter took up tragic poetry before the age of 25, his death could not be placed more than a few years after 350. At the closest possible estimate he died from 10 to 15 years earlier than was assumed in Welcker's combination.

The year of Theodectas' birth was accordingly not far from 390. He may well have been a pupil of Plato and Isocrates, but he must have been the friend rather than the disciple of Aristotle, who was several years his junior, and not some ten years his senior, as one has supposed hitherto. In this connection it is significant that the Vit. X Orat. (837 c) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Isaeus, sub fin.) both report that the poet was a pupil of Isocrates, but say nothing of Aristotle. It is evident that Suidas or his source was tempted to bring together the great trio. Theodectas was not a youth of 24 when invited to do honor to the memory of Mausolus in 351, but a mature and accomplished man of 40, whose reputation was firmly established. Alexander could not have known him personally,¹ but learned to esteem the man and his works through the poet's friend and collaborator, Aristotle. This is the meaning of *ὁμιλία* in Plutarch's reference to Alexander's act of homage: οὐκ ἄχαριν ἐν παιδιᾷ τιμὴν ἀποδιδούς τῇ γενομένη δι' Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ὁμιλία πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα.

Astydamas, father and son.—Since the date which we have been able to reach for the first victory of Theodectas depends somewhat upon our interpretation of the notice in the Parian Marble for the year 372, it may be well to state here the reasons which oblige us to assume that this chronicle records only first victories. It contains six notices of dramatic victories in a form sufficiently complete to be of service. In three of these the phrase is *πρῶτον ἐνίκησεν*—Aeschylus in 484, Euripides in 441, and Menander in 315 (new frag., Ath. Mitth. 1897, p. 187). The victory of Sophocles in 468 we know from Plutarch, Cimon 8, to have been his first victory, won at the City Dionysia. Philemon is set down as victorious in 327; he could scarcely have won before this date, and we know that his first Lenaeon victory was not gained for some years afterward. The omission of *πρῶτον* in the case of Astydamas consequently signifies nothing. When, now, in the catalogue of victors at the City Dionysia we find that a poet Astydamas won his first victory between 376 and 362—and both of these dates, though approximate, are derived from evidence independent of the inscription—the conclusion is irresistible that the victory of Astydamas in 372 was his first victory—indeed, his first City victory—determining the position of his

¹ Pseudo-Callisthenes 3, 17, the only author who asserts the contrary, will not, of course, be accepted as a witness in the matter.

name in the victors' list. Thus what was only a shrewd conjecture of Clinton must now be recognized as a demonstrated fact.

We are now confronted by the difficult problems arising out of the notices relative to the elder and the younger Astydamas. According to Suidas, the elder poet, son of Morsimus, wrote 240 plays and won 15 victories. A pupil of Isocrates, he afterwards turned his attention to tragedy. Of the younger poet Suidas mentions the titles of eight plays, giving no details concerning his career. Diodorus Sic. 14, 43, gives this notice about the elder Astydamas: Ἀστυδάμας ὁ τραγωδογράφος τότε πρῶτον (archonship of Aristocrates, 399/8) ἐδίδαξεν,¹ ἔζησε δὲ ἔτη ἐξήκοντα. So far there is nothing to excite suspicion except the statement of Suidas that the elder Astydamas was a pupil of Isocrates. This is clearly impossible if the date furnished by Diodorus is correct.

But another set of notices introduces some grave contradictions with this evidence. Suidas, Photius, Zenobius, and Schol. Liban., Epist. 317, p. 153, assign the Parthenopaeus (which is not among the eight plays of the younger poet enumerated in Suidas) to the elder Astydamas, son of Morsimus.² They explain the origin of the well-known proverb *σαντὴν ἐπαινέεις*, relating the story of the self-laudatory inscription composed by the poet for the basis of the statue voted in his honor after the performance of the Parthenopaeus. So long as the date of this play was unknown, there was nothing improbable in its attribution to Astydamas the father. But the programme of the tragic contest at the Dionysia of the year 340 (CIA. II 973) mentions the Parthenopaeus as one of the two plays of the victor, Astydamas.³

If Diodorus is right, the elder poet died ca. 358. We now have two difficulties in the tradition, assuming that the account of Diodorus is trustworthy: 1) the mistake of making the elder poet a pupil of Isocrates, and 2) the contradiction involved in ascribing the Parthenopaeus to him.

¹Chandler used this notice for the restoration of Mar. Par., ll. 80 f.: ἀφ' οὗ Ἀ[στυδάμας πρῶτον ἐδίδαξεν] Ἀθήνησιν . . . ἀρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν Ἀριστοκράτους. But the first two letters of the name are given as either AI or AII, so that no weight can be attached to this conjecture.

²Suidas, s. v. *σαντὴν ἐπαινέεις*; Photius, II 143, the same, word for word, as in Suidas; Zenobius 5, 100, the same story cast into a slightly different form. See Prager, *Insc. Metric.* 158, for the numerous allusions to the proverb. Dörpfeld, *Gr. Theat.*, p. 70, is wrong in thinking that the inscription proposed by the poet was actually inscribed on the monument.

³By an oversight, Dieterich gives the date as 368.

Susemihl, who has discussed this question most recently (Rhein. Mus. 49, 1894, p. 473), attaches great importance to the statement of Suidas about Isocrates. He sees that both difficulties can be removed if we but assume that Diodorus is in error, rather than Suidas, as has been generally believed.¹ The source of all the trouble, he holds, is in the date of the poet's first appearance, which ought to be the date of his birth. If he was *born* in 398, his first victory would be that of 372, and his death would fall in 338. In support of this theory he urges first the great improbability that the elder Astydamas, beginning his career in 398, did not achieve a victory until 372, and crowded the rest of his 15 victories into the next 14 years; and secondly the fact that the solution he adopts involves only one error in the tradition, while every other proposal involves at least two. As to the first of these two arguments, no answer is needed. If the statement of Diodorus is correct, then the victory of 372 must be assigned to the second Astydamas, not to the first, as we have shown. In the second place, the method followed by Susemihl, of adopting the solution that involves the smaller number of corrections in the tradition, is not sound, especially when Suidas is one of our authorities as over against Diodorus. It is better to assume a dozen errors in the former for which we can give a good explanation than one in the latter for which we can not account. Before attempting a simpler method of solving the problem, one word about the ancestors of the elder Astydamas. Philocles, his grandfather, was a nephew of Aeschylus. He was a mature man and an experienced poet in the thirties, when he defeated Sophocles and the Oedipus. His son Morsimus, the father of Astydamas, was held up to ridicule by Aristophanes as early as 424 (Eq. 401). Susemihl admits that, on his hypothesis, he would have been over fifty at the birth of his son, but cheerfully adds: "so etwas kommt ja alle Tage vor." But he was more likely sixty years old in 398, and ten years nearer the record held by Abraham and Masinissa (Appian Pun. 105). So this theory is not without its difficulties even after we have disposed of Diodorus.

We have seen that in the catalogue of victors the name of Astydamas is associated with those of two disciples of Isocrates—Theodectas and Aphareus. The victor of 372, it can hardly be doubted, was also the rhetor-poet of Suidas' first notice. The author of the Parthenopaeus was the more celebrated Astydamas,

¹ See the article of Susemihl for the literature on the question.

whose victories numbered 15. So far we are in agreement with Susemihl. Now I think that it can be shown that the elder Astydamas, even if he lived until 338, was probably not the poet of the Parthenopaeus. The story of the laudatory inscription proposed by the poet for himself implies that he was alive when the basis was ready to be inscribed and set up. A part of this basis has been found in the theatre (CIA. II 1363). It was incorporated in the western supporting wall of the auditorium, being so cut as to form the end toward the orchestra (Dörpfeld, *Gr. Theat.*, pp. 38, 71). This portion of the theatre was therefore not completed when the Parthenopaeus was performed. The half-finished building was taken in charge by Lycurgus, whose administration of the finances began in 338, and was pushed to completion in the ensuing years. But possibly, it may be urged, the aged Astydamas submitted his verses while on his death-bed. This too is improbable, for the proverb *σαντήν ἐπαινέεις* seems to have been coined, or at least put in a popular form, by Philemon, who did not begin his career as a poet until the end of the thirties. Now, the line *σαντήν ἐπαινέεις, ὥσπερ Ἀστυδάμας, γύναι* (fr. 190, Kock) would have had distinctly more point and would have been much more likely to raise a laugh if the poet were alive and in the audience, than if he had only a few years before been borne to his grave covered with honors and universally lamented—the last great poet of the line of Aeschylus. These considerations are not advanced as proof, but as lending somewhat greater improbability to an hypothesis which is in itself distinctly improbable.

If, on the other hand, the younger Astydamas was the author of the Parthenopaeus, then not simply the single statement of Suidas concerning Isocrates is wrong, but all of the latter part of the notice. Here lies the solution. The facts that refer to the son have been transferred, by a simple error of transmission, such as abound in Suidas, to the father. The biographical notices should therefore read:

1) Ἀστυδάμας, υἱὸς Μορσίμου τοῦ Φιλοκλέους, τραγικῶν ἀμφοτέρων, Ἀθηναῖος τραγικός.

2) Ἀστυδάμας ὁ νέος, υἱὸς τοῦ προτέρου, τραγικὸς καὶ αὐτός. δράματα αὐτοῦ . . . <ἔγραψε τραγωδίας σμ' (?), ἐνίκησε ιε'. ἀκροασάμενος δὲ ἦν Ἰσοκράτους, καὶ ἐτράπη ἐπὶ τραγωδίαν.>

The error in the notices about the Parthenopaeus may have been due to the confusion of the names—that is, to an error of

ignorance—but it was more likely due, as it seems to me, to haplography. The notice in Suidas and Photius may have read originally: 'Αστυδάμαντι τῷ <'Αστυδάμαντος τοῦ> Μορσίμου εὐήμερῶσιν ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας διδασκαλία Παρθενοπαίου δοθῆναι ὑπ' 'Αθηναίων εἰκόνας ἀνάθεσιν ἐν θεάτρῳ. We have assumed two errors in the tradition, it is true, but they were palaeographical errors of a common type; Susemihl made shift with one, but one the correction of which as proposed involves not inconsiderable improbabilities in connection with both the birth and the death of the elder Astydamas, and one which in itself is most difficult to account for.

The Two Apollodori.—Suidas has the following articles on the comic poets Apollodorus, a notice on the grammarian Apollodorus intervening:

- 1) 'Απολλόδωρος, 'Αθηναῖος κωμικός. ἐποίησε δράματα μζ', ἐνίκησε ε'.
- 2) 'Απολλόδωρος, Γελῶος, κωμικός. σύγχρονος τοῦ κωμικοῦ Μενάνδρου. δράματα αὐτοῦ . . . (seven titles follow).

An Apollodorus of Carystus is frequently quoted. Before Meineke it was generally believed that there were three comic poets of this name. But, since Suidas does not mention the Carystian, and the Athenian is mentioned by no one but Suidas, Meineke (*Hist. Crit.*, p. 462) identified the latter with the former. This opinion has prevailed hitherto. Kaibel, however (*Pauly-Wissowa Encycl.*, s. v. Apollodorus), now identifies all three.¹ He notes that the articles in Suidas supplement each other, and accordingly concludes that they originally formed a whole, now separated by the misplaced article on the grammarian Apollodorus. He advances the following considerations in support of his view: 1) Two plays included in the list given in Suidas for the Geloan, the *Γραμματεῖδιοποιός* and the *Ἰέρεια*, are cited under the name of the Carystian also. 2) Other plays, not in the list, are referred to under both names and by the simple name of Apollodorus. The latter is most usual. 3) In the *didascalia* of the *Phormio* and in the commentary of Donatus, in *Aul. Gell.* 2, 23, *Anon. περὶ κωμ.* II (Kaib.), and the list of victors, *CIA.* II 977 g, only one poet of the name is mentioned and no distinguishing epithet is employed. 4) The style of the Geloan and Carystian (and Athenian) is identical.

There are two obvious objections to this view, both of which Kaibel anticipates. In the first place, the existence of the epithets

¹ Meineke, l. c., quotes the opinion of Kuhn to the same effect, with the comment: "nihil habet quo commendetur."

'Αθηναῖος, Γελῶος, and Καρύστιος must be accounted for. But citizenship was very freely bestowed at that time, and Apollodorus may well have been thus honored by two cities besides his own. A more serious matter is that of date. Suidas, as we have seen, calls the Geloan a contemporary of Menander. But this, according to Kaibel, was but another way of saying that he belonged to the New Comedy. So Diphilos in Anonymous (κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐδίδαξε Μενάνδρῳ), and Lynceus in Suidas (σύγχρονος γέγονεν Μενάνδρου τοῦ κωμικοῦ), and Poseidippus in Suidas (τρίτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸ τελευτῆσαι τὸν Μένανδρον διδάξας) are all dated in terms of Menander. As for the date of the Carystian derived from Athenaeus 14, 664 a, Kaibel holds that the language implies similarity rather than contemporaneousness.

It must be acknowledged that these arguments, if taken at their face value, make a strong case for Kaibel's contention. But I am convinced that they do not bear examination. After all, the only positive argument is that based on the style of the fragments; the rest tend to show no more than the possibility, or, if you please, the probability, of the proposed identification. But can even so expert a critic of style as Kaibel set up such a claim on the basis of the extant remains? Less than ten verses are assigned by Kock¹ to the Geloan, and among them only one complete sentence. Some forty-five verses are given to the Carystian. A large proportion of all the fragments is quoted in illustration of uncommon words. In such a collection it would not be strange if one found a certain uniformity of style, if we can use the word 'style' at all. The third of Kaibel's arguments would have weight if in the passages cited we had any right to demand the names of both Apollodori, with their appropriate designations. On the contrary, the Anonymous writer expressly states that he gives only the ἀξιολογώτατοι of the New Comedy. Nobody has claimed such an honor for Apollodorus Gelous. As for the epithet, Philemon is in no way distinguished from the two other comic poets of this name, and yet nobody is deceived. The official lists of victors never distinguish between homonyms. The portion of the Lenaeon list to which Kaibel refers could not

¹ Kock's treatment of the two Apollodori is very unsatisfactory. For example, he assigns two fragments of the Γραμ. to the Geloan, the third to the Carystian, according as they chanced to be quoted. But even if we transfer the odd fragment to the Geloan, we remove practically the only fragment of which 'style' might be predicated from the remains of the Carystian.

have embraced the name of the second Apollodorus, supposing that there was such a person, unless his first victory was won within about 15 years after that of the first of the name. The fact that only one Apollodorus appears in this list is, consequently, of no significance to those who believe that the Carystian was a generation later than the Geloan. The passage of Aulus Gellius runs: *comoedias lectitamus nostrorum poetarum sumptas ac uersas de Graecis, Menandro ac Posidippo aut Apollodoro aut Alexidi, et quibusdam item aliis comicis*. In such a selection I fail to see why we should expect to find both Apollodori. Nor can an inference, in my opinion, be drawn from the fact that here and in the *didascalia* to the *Phormio* there is no attempt to distinguish this Apollodorus from another of the same name. To the Romans there was ordinarily only one Apollodorus, as there was but one Philemon. The learned *Life of Terence*¹ published by Mai furnishes the only exception.

Nor does Kaibel's answer to the two obvious objections to his theory seem quite convincing. Assume that a poet from Carystus was admitted to citizenship at Athens and was made an honorary citizen of Gela also. He might well be referred to indifferently either as an Athenian or as a Carystian, and possibly as a Geloan by the Geloans; but surely the Athenians, or the ancient writers whose sources were all Athenian, would never have spoken of him as 'the Geloan.'² The fact that in such writers we find both epithets in current usage points distinctly to two different indi-

¹ *Quattuor e Menandro translate . . . duae ex Apollodoro Caricio, Hecyra et Phormio.*

² If he resided permanently in Athens and had received the citizenship, he would call himself by preference an Athenian, and would be so called officially, but outside of Athens he would generally be designated by his native city. At least this seems to be a safe inference from a number of examples which I have collected. The following instances of comic poets may be cited. The elder Philemon was from Syracuse and is called a Syracusan by Suidas and Anon. *περί κωμ.*, and in the inscription CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1221. But in the official inscriptions CIA. II 1289 and III 948 he is given his deme name *Διομειεύς*. So Diodorus from Synope is called *Συνωπεύς* in the Delian inscriptions B. C. H. 2, pp. 104, 106, but on his tombstone, CIA. II 3343, is designated by his deme *Σημαχίδαί*. The comic poet Diomedes, whose statue was set up in the theatre (CIA. III 952), is found in an inscription from Magnesia on the Meander (Ath. Mitth. 19, p. 96) as *Δ. Ἀθηνόδωρον Περγαμηνός*; but in a dedication in his honor found at Epidaurus (Εφ. Ἀρχ. 1883, p. 27) we have *Δ. Ἀθηνόδωρον Ἀθηναῖος*. In an Athenian inscription CIA. III 769, *Καπίων* is described as a *ποιητὴς Περγαμηνός καὶ Ἀθηναῖος*. Examples could be multiplied.

viduals. Finally, let us see how the case really stands regarding the dates which Meineke believed he established. The language of Athenaeus (Μάχων δ' ὁ Σικυώνιος τῶν κατὰ Ἀπολλύδωρον τὸν Καρύστιον κωμικοποιῶν εἰς ἑστὶ καὶ αὐτός), to my thinking, clearly implies that Machon, who was the instructor of Aristophanes of Byzantium in matters pertaining to comedy (Ath. 6, 241 f.), was a contemporary of Apollodorus Carystius. But opinions may differ on this point. But surely the phrase σύγχρονος τοῦ Μενάνδρου is more than an indefinite reference to the time of the New Comedy. Let us see if Diphilus, Lynceus, and Poseidippus, who are also dated by reference to Menander, are really illustrations of Kaibel's contention. For Diphilus we have the testimony of Philemon himself in the words of Tranio, in Plautus, Mostell. 1149 si amicus Deiphilo aut Philemoni's. In the list of victors, frag. g, Diphilus is in the third place after Menander and second after Philemon. The language of Anonymous is therefore about as exact and definite as it could be. Lynceus was the brother of the historian Duris and pupil of Theophrastus. He was thus, in fact, Menander's contemporary, and we may accept the other explicit statement of Suidas, that he once defeated his great rival. Poseidippus is said to have exhibited first two years after Menander's death. We can not control this statement to the year, but can show that Suidas was not far wrong, at any rate. Poseidippus undoubtedly won a Lenaeon victory. But on frag. g of the Lenaeon list of victors, which includes eight names after Menander, his name is not found. This represents an interval of about 18 years—the *minimum* of time which may have elapsed between the first victory of Menander, which was not before 321, and the first victory of Poseidippus. When we consider that so precise a notice as this of Suidas probably was based upon the official didascalic records, it would seem that it has been needlessly suspected. I may add that the other notices of this character in Anonymous and in Suidas—that is, those which fix the time of a poet by reference to a contemporary—are found to be surprisingly accurate when tested by what remains of the victors' lists.¹

After all that has been said to weaken the force of Kaibel's arguments, I should feel that the principal argument for the identification of the Apollodori—that is, the deliberate opinion of this

¹ E.g. Eupolis in Anon., and Theopompus, Plato, Nicophon, and Nicocharas in Suidas. Aristophanes, to whom these last-named poets are referred, had a long career, so that σύγχρονος is in his case a sufficiently broad term.

distinguished scholar—were still unimpaired, unless we should succeed in producing new evidence on the other side. It must be made clear that the Carystian was of a later date than the Geloan, and that without the aid of the passage in Athenaeus concerning Machon. That there was an Apollodorus σύγχρονος τοῦ Μενάνδρου is established by the victors' list, CIA. II 977 g—Μένανδρος, Φιλῆμων, Ἀπολλόδωρος, Δίφιλος, Φιλιππίδης, κτέ. That there was also an Apollodorus in the next generation, a contemporary of Poseidippus, is an equally certain inference, in my opinion, from the list of the principal poets of the New Comedy given by Anonymous: Philemon, Menander, Diphilus, Philippides, Poseidippus, Apollodorus. In its enumeration of the poets of the Old Comedy, this valuable article follows a strictly chronological order. The same holds true of the present enumeration, unless Apollodorus alone forms an exception, for every name after the two first can be checked off against the names in the official victors' list, so far as it goes. Were this list the record of the Dionysia, and not of the Lenaea, the two first would also be found in the order given in Anonymous. I see no way of explaining the position of Apollodorus *after* Poseidippus except by going back to the old belief in Apollodorus of Carystus as distinct from Apollodorus of Gela. The chronological data furnished by the ancients are in harmony in every particular with the order of names here given. Apollodorus of Gela, the contemporary of Menander in the victors' list, has no place in the select list of ἀξιολογώτατοι in Anonymous. Completely overshadowed as a poet by the younger man, he well-nigh loses his place in the history of literature as well, for the simple name 'Apollodorus' is understood by everybody to mean the Carystian. To identify these two poets creates difficulties where no contradictions existed before, and does violence to some very explicit and apparently trustworthy statements of the ancients, as well as to the testimony, unconscious and therefore less open to suspicion, of Anonymous περὶ κωμῳδίας and the victors' list.

The task of assigning the extant fragments to their right authors is no less difficult than before, but it would be easy to improve upon Kock. In the first place, it is *a priori* probable that every play ascribed to the Geloan belongs to him. The plays of the famous Carystian are less likely to have been ascribed to his less-popular and less-known double. Other considerations support this view in the case of two plays. Wilamowitz has shown (Ind.

lect. Gött. 1893/4, p. 14—quoted by Kaibel) that the Γραμματεῖ-διοποιοῖς, which is in the list of Suidas and attributed to the Geloan twice by Pollux, though to the Carystian by Athenaeus, was written before 300. There is also internal evidence for as early a date for the 'Ιέρεια, also in the list of Suidas, but referred to the Carystian by Athenaeus. To the younger poet may be assigned, on the other hand, all plays that are quoted by the unqualified name 'Apollodorus,' and also the Ἔκυρα and Ἐπιδικαζόμενος, on the authority of the Vita Terentii.

Cephisodotus and Cephisodorus.—In the Lenaeon list of victors, at the foot of the third extant column and in the ninth place before Menander, stands the name [Κηφισόδω]ρος I. Though only three letters remain, the restoration proposed by Köhler may be accepted as certain, giving as it does the name of a well-known comic poet that satisfies perfectly the conditions of space. The date of the single victory of this poet can not be far from 345. Now, the Cephisodorus whom we have known hitherto has been universally assigned to the Old Comedy. A comic poet of this name, according to the vulgate text of Lysias 21, 4, won a victory in the archonship of Euclid. At this time the practice of appointing two men to bear the burdens of the choregia together was followed for the tragic and comic exhibitions at the City Dionysia (Aristotle apud Schol. Arist., Ran. 404). But the speaker in Lysias gives us to understand that he alone met the expenses at the occasion referred to (κωμικοῖς χορηγῶν Κηφισοδώρῳ ἐνίκων, καὶ ἀνήλωσα σὺν τῇ σκευῇ ἀναθήσει ἑκκαίδεκα μνᾶς). Hence it is believed that the victory of the poet of 402 was won at the Lenaea.¹ We should accordingly expect to find the name of this poet in col. II of the list before us. But, unfortunately, the last six names in this column are lost. In the corresponding portion of the list of victors at the Dionysia (frag. k, 3d l. of col. III), however, we find the name of [Κη]φισο-. Between this name and that of Euphronius in col. I (frag. i), 26 or 27 names intervened on the original stone. Since Euphronius won his single victory in 458 (CIA. II 971 f.), the first victory of Κηφισο- was won in the neighborhood of 400. There can be no doubt, therefore, of the identity of this poet and the victor of 402 in Lysias. It is equally certain that the Κηφισόδωρος of col. III is an entirely different

¹ See article on the Synchoregia in Am. Journ. Phil. 17 (1896), p. 322, and Haigh, Attic Theatre³, p. 75.

person. We have therefore a new name to add to our *index poetarum*.

How, then, shall we restore the name in frag. *k*? The manuscripts of Lysias all give Κηφισοδότῳ. This has been changed by common consent with Clinton (Fast. Hell. under year 403/2) to -δώρῳ, for the sake of identifying this poet with the Cephisodorus known from Suidas and over a dozen citations in other authors. But, now that we have found a poet Cephisodorus who is not identical with the poet in Lysias, the original presumption in favor of the change absolutely disappears, and we should unhesitatingly restore the reading of the manuscripts in Lysias and the name [Κη]φισό[δοτος] in the inscription.

But we have still to reckon with Suidas, whose notice is as follows: Κηφισόδωρος Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικός τῆς ἀρχαίας τραγωδίας. ἔστιν αὐτοῦ τῶν δραμάτων Ἀντιλαῖς Ἀμαζόνες Τρωφώνιος Ὑς. The article is clearly corrupt. The titles are all comic, and the necessity of correcting τραγικός and τραγωδίας to κωμικός and κωμωδίας is obvious. But even so the Cephisodorus whom we know from frag. *g* of the victors' list did not belong to the Old Comedy, and the poet of the Old Comedy of frag. *k* was not necessarily, as we have seen, Cephisodorus. It may, after all, be necessary to adopt the textual change in Lysias. But there is a simpler way of accounting for the error. Preceding the notice in Suidas which we have quoted is an article on Κηφισόδοτος, a general. If we suppose that in the source or in the original form of Suidas this article was followed by an article on Κηφισόδοτος, κωμικός τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας, and this by the present article on Κηφισόδωρος, who was, however, characterized as κωμικός τῆς μέσης κωμωδίας, nothing could be more natural than that the transcriber's eye passed over the second Κηφισόδοτος to Κηφισόδωρος, then back to the description τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμ., and possibly confounded the titles of the plays of the two poets also. This kind of error is found all through Suidas. As for the confusion of τραγικός and κωμικός, see the examples cited by Meineke in Hist. Crit., pp. 340, 521 sqq.

All of the extant fragments are quoted under the name of Cephisodorus; they should therefore be assigned to the poet of the Middle Comedy. Among the titles of the plays thus quoted are the last three mentioned by Suidas. There is nothing either in the scanty fragments or in the allusions of Athenaeus and Pollux which indicates a date, and the titles are such as we find in the Middle Comedy. On the other hand, the first play men-

tioned in Suidas, Ἀντιλαΐς, is never quoted. Meineke (Hist. Crit., pp. 414 and 267) pointed out that the title has reference to Lais, the famous *éraipa* of the last part of the fifth century and the beginning of the fourth. Epicrates, who flourished in the early part of the fourth century, also wrote a comedy with this title. One might suspect, therefore, that this play at least was produced by Cephisodotus. Its omission from the list of titles in Eudocia (p. 443, Flach), otherwise identical with that in Suidas, may have been due to the textual history of the notice which has been suggested. The indications are too slight, however, for any positive conclusions. In any event, the plays of Cephisodotus were probably not extant at the time of the Alexandrian grammarians.

Aristomenes.—The notice of Suidas is: Ἀριστομένης, Ἀθηναῖος, κωμικός τῶν ἐπιδευτέρων τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας, οἱ ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν, Ὀλυμπιάδων πζ'. The dating is consistent with itself, for Phrynichus is also classed among the ἐπιδεύτεροι, and made his first appearance in 431. A poet of this name appears as a competitor of Aristophanes in 387; hence the statement which we find in the Pauly-Wissowa Encyclopädie, that Aristomenes was "durchaus Zeit- und Altersgenossen des Aristophanes."¹ This would give a career of 44 years. Meineke (op. cit., p. 211) thinks this improbable, suggesting that the didascalical notice prefixed to the *Plutus* is a blending of two such records, one referring to the first production of the *Plutus* in 408, in which the name of Aristomenes appeared, the other to the second performance. Kock (vol. I, p. 690) quotes this opinion with approval, although he should know—in Meineke's time it was not known—that the presence of five names in the didascalia of the *Plutus*, as opposed to the three found in earlier notices, is simply an indication that the number of competing plays had been increased from three to five. It must be accepted, then, as an established fact that Aristomenes, or a poet of similar name, competed as late as 387.

The catalogue of Lenean victors makes it certain that the first appearance of this poet was several years before 431, and that

¹He is also credited with two victories each at the Dionysia and at the Leneae. But CIA. II 977 a', which contains the name Aristomenes, can not belong to the list of comic poets. Even if it did, there would be a century between. See my article on these catalogues in the last number of this Journal.

this date in Suidas is to be considered rather his acme, or of his first victory at the Dionysia. The name of Aristomenes is in the sixth place above that of Eupolis. We do not know precisely the year of the latter's first Lenaeon victory, but it must have been before that of Aristophanes, who was victorious with the Acharnians at the Lenaea of 425. Cratinus died ca. 422, so that his second and third victories must be placed somewhere before that date. Now the year 424 is also occupied by a victory of Aristophanes (Knights). If, then, we suppose that the six poets between Aristophanes and Aristomenes won only once each before 423, and that the predecessors of the latter won no victories in the interval, the latest possible date of the first victory of Aristomenes is 434.¹ Obviously, this calculation leaves too little margin for the extra victories of the earlier poets. Let us take another starting-point, the victory of Cephisodotus in 402. His name must have stood in the second place after Philonicus in col. II. Aristomenes was the twenty-fifth name preceding. We are safe in assuming that before 402 Telecleides had won all of his five victories, Cratinus three, Pherecrates two, Phrynichus probably two, Eupolis three,—occupying in all ten extra years. To these ten we may add two² victories for Aristophanes after his first (Eq. in 424, Ran. in 405). Allowing but one victory in this period to the other poets between Aristomenes and Cephisodotus, and none to the predecessors of the former, the first Lenaeon victory of Aristomenes is carried back to 439 at the latest, i. e. $25 + 12 + 402$. When we consider the victories of the predecessors of Aristomenes in this interval, we are certainly safe in placing his first victory not far from 445, to say nothing of his first appearance.

This being so, are we to believe that this Aristomenes is the same poet who competed with Aristophanes in 387? Since there is not a vestige of testimony to the existence of two comic poets

¹ Aristomenes being the seventh name before Aristophanes (425) and Cratinus winning twice in the interval. This assumes that the name of Aristophanes came immediately after Eupolis. I believe that it did, but possibly one or two names intervened.

² I omit the possible victory with the Wasps in 423, which rests upon a very uncertain revision of the corrupt didascalic notice. When we consider the large number of poets that must be crowded into the interval between Aristophanes and Cephisodotus, it seems more than ever probable that Philonides was victor in 423 with the *Προαγών*.

of this name, opinions will vary in this matter. Bergk,¹ although he did not know that the difference between the date given by Suidas and that indicated by the inscription was as great as we have shown it to be, concluded that there were two poets, one the contemporary of Cratinus, the other of Aristophanes. A dramatic career of over 60 years is not unexampled on the Attic stage: witness Sophocles, Alexis, and Philemon. Perhaps the strangest thing is that we should have heard so little about a man so remarkable, and that he should have had so little success. The most plausible solution, in my opinion, would be to correct 'Αριστομένης in the hypothesis to the *Plutus* to 'Αριστῶννος. The date of the latter would be entirely suitable. The name of Aristomenes is corrupted four times in ancient authors to Aristophanes, and the similarity of names may have led to a similar corruption in the didascalical notice. The comedy *Admetus* is known only from this notice. It may also be suggested as a possibility that the name of Theopompus, who was the author of a play *Admetus*, was displaced in some way by that of Aristomenes.

Antiphanes.—The chronology of Antiphanes has always been a perplexing problem. The accepted view is that of Clinton (*Phil. Mus.* 1, 1832, pp. 607 sqq.), that he was born in the ninety-third Olympiad (408–5), began to exhibit in the ninety-eighth (388–5), and died between 334 and 331. This result is derived from Suidas, who says: γέγονε κατὰ τὴν 57' ὀλυμπιάδα, and that he died at the age of 74, and from Anonymous II *περὶ κωμῳδίας*, who reports that he began to exhibit μετὰ τὴν 57' ὀλ. But the further statement of the latter, that Antiphanes was admitted to Athenian citizenship on the proposal of Demosthenes, must be rejected as inconsistent with the other data, and the comedy *Παρεκδιδομένη*, or at least the fragment quoted by Athenaeus, in which Seleucus is referred to as βασιλεύς, must be attributed to another poet. Perhaps quite the most serious objection to this solution is the word γέγονε in Suidas. Rohde has shown by a most careful analysis of all passages in Suidas in which this word occurs (*Rhein. Mus.* 33, 1878, pp. 161–220), that, out of 129 instances,

¹ *Rhein. Mus.* 34, 1879, 292 sqq. Thinking that this inscription was a portion of the Dionysiac catalogue, he had no datable event from which to reckon, for he did not trust the notice of the victory of Ameipsias at the Dionysia of 414.

the meaning 'natus est' is certain in only 6, among which he includes the reference to Antiphanes. In the overwhelming majority of cases γέγονε is equivalent to ἤκμαζε. Meineke found the greatest difficulty in the reference to Seleucus, and was disposed to correct οδ' to ρδ' in Suidas, thus prolonging the poet's life to ca. 304. But this proposal, involving a dramatic career of 84 years, has naturally met with no favor.

The Lenaeon list of victors, unfortunately, does not furnish us with new facts of a sufficiently definite character to settle, once for all, the difficulties which have been pointed out. After the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 we know of only one Lenaeon victory, that of Philemon in 306, which was not his first victory. We shall, consequently, have no absolutely certain point of departure, but shall be obliged to employ chronological data of a more general character. Our results will of necessity be only approximate and relative; and yet they may at least indicate roughly the position which Antiphanes held in relation to his contemporaries among the comic poets, and thus point to the true source of the contradictions in our evidence.

We have information about two of the contemporaries of Antiphanes—Anaxandrides and Eubulus. The first City victory of the former was won in 376, according to the Parian Chronicle.¹ The strange statement of Suidas: γεγονώς ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι Φιλίππου τοῦ Μακεδόνα, δλ. ρα', is at least not at variance with the Chronicle. Eubulus, according to Suidas, flourished in the 101st Olympiad, 376-3. These data have reference, no doubt, to the Dionysia, so that it is quite possible that both Anaxandrides and Eubulus were successful at the Lenaea before 376. Now in the Lenaeon list we find these names: Anaxandrides, Philetaerus, Eubulus, Ehippus, Antiphanes. The position of the names of Anaxandrides and Eubulus close to each other is in harmony with the evidence which we have just examined. But if Antiphanes began to exhibit as early as 388-5, it is surprising that we should find his name in the list four lines after that of Anaxandrides. We may

¹ L. 82: ἀφ' οὗ Ἀναξανδρίδης ὁ κωμ[ωδοποιὸς] πρῶτον ἐνίκησεν, ἐτη ΠΔΙΙΙ, ἀρχοντος] Ἀθήνησιν Καλλέου. There can be no doubt that this is the correct restoration. Bergk, Litt. Gesch. IV, p. 158, insisted that this must be a dithyrambic victory, relying on his interpretation of CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1098, and pointing to the fact that the Chronicle never refers to comic victories. The newly discovered fragment corrects this assumption. His interpretation of the didascalic inscription can not be defended. The epithet κωμωδοποιός is decisive.

estimate the discrepancy at from 15 to 20 years. It is of course possible that, for some reason, his first success at the Lenaea was delayed this long. One might refer to the case of Cratinus, who seems to have won a victory at the Dionysia about 10 years before he was successful at the Lenaea, and to Philemon, whose first Lenaeon victory was some seven years after his first City victory. And yet both Cratinus and Philemon seem to have reserved their strength for the City Dionysia, at which they won a large majority of their victories. Antiphanes, on the other hand, won 8 of his 13 victories at the Lenaea, whereas Anaxandrides was victorious only three times at the Lenaea, but seven times at the Dionysia. Thus every consideration seems to point to a later date for the first appearance of Antiphanes than that given by Anonymous.

We reach the same general result by another method, keeping entirely to our list of victors. Between the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 and that of Menander, which can scarcely have been later than 321, is an interval of 81 years. Our catalogues gave the names of 28 poets in this period. Some of the victories after 402 were undoubtedly won by predecessors of Cephisodotus. We may estimate the number at 10,¹ leaving 71 victories, or an average of about 2½ victories for each poet. Assuming that this average was constant, the first victory of Antiphanes would fall in the year 367. This result tallies with that which we have already obtained. Anonymous places the date of Antiphanes' entrance upon his dramatic career about 20 years too high.

There is no trustworthy indication of a date anterior to 367 in the extant fragments.² Meineke thought that the *Ἀντρίαι*, in which the perfumer Pero was mentioned, should be dated ca. 376, for this person was mentioned also in the *Admetus* of Theopompus, produced in 387, and in a play of Anaxandrides of uncertain date. For a similar reason he placed the *Ὁμφάλη* in the same period, because the baker Theario, whom Aristophanes mentioned in two

¹ This seems liberal enough, considering the small number of victories assigned to the immediate predecessors of Cephisodotus. The result which we shall reach, however, would not be affected at all if a lower or higher estimate were adopted.

² The earliest play that can be dated positively has been thought to be the *Ἀνασφύζοντες*, on the strength of CIA. II 972. But I have shown elsewhere that the archon Diotimus of this inscription was the magistrate of 289/8, and not of 354/3, as Boeckh and Koehler thought. See *Am. Jour. Arch.*, vol. IV, No. 1.

of his later plays, is referred to. But no reliance can be placed in such evidence.¹ On the other hand, the *Κιθαριστής* must have been produced after the defeat of Agis by Antipater in 330, and the *Δίδυμοι* still later, if frag. 81 is to receive a natural interpretation. Quite apart, therefore, from the *Παρεκδομένη*, to which we shall return, there is good reason for believing that Antiphanes can not have died as early as 331. We are accordingly bound to follow up the indications, which we have found in the catalogue of victors, of a date later than that furnished by Anonymous, and to seek an explanation of the error in the tradition.

In the first place, we should give the word *γέγονε* in Suidas its usual and proper meaning of 'floruit,' and adopt Bernhardt's² correction of *Σγ'* to *ργ'* (368-5). The *floruit* of the dramatic poets was readily fixed by the ancients by reference to the pinacographical material and official documents which formed the basis of Aristotle's *Διδασκαλίας* and *Νίκαι Διονυσιακαὶ καὶ Ληναϊκαί*. The peripatetics studied these sources diligently. The valuable article of Anonymous II *περὶ κωμῳδίας* is largely compiled from such documents. It is significant that in it the vague *γέγονε* occurs only once, and that in the notice on Epicharmus, concerning whom no didascalic information was available. Elsewhere we find the more definite *νικᾷ* or *πρῶτον ἐδίδαξε*. The same holds true of the Parian Chronicle. Now there can be no doubt that *γέγονε* and *ἦν* in Suidas, as well as the *ἐγνωρίζετο* of the chronographers, were but a convenient equivalent of *πρῶτον ἐδίδαξε* or *ἐνίκη*. *γέγονε* then designated not the real acme, but what Kaibel terms the "half acme." From this as a starting-point it was easy for the ancient biographer to arrive at an approximate date for the birth of the poet, assisted often, no doubt, by allusions in his earlier dramas; for the birth-date was of course not a matter of record.³ The accounts of Anonymous and Suidas go back, therefore, to a common source, and, where they give information on the same point, should be in agreement. If the correct form of the state-

¹ We do not know how long Pero lived. As for Theario, the allusion in the *Ὀμφάλη* (frag. 176, K.) would be just as much in point if the baker had been dead for years.

² Bernhardt, however, took *γέγονε* to mean 'natus est.'

³ See Kaibel on Menander, in CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1184, and in his notices on the comic poets in Pauly-Wissowa. The statements about the youth of Eupolis and Menander at their first exhibitions were probably derived from their plays.

ment in Suidas was γέγονε κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ., the parallel statement in Anonymous was originally ἤρξατο διδάσκειν κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ.

The notice as it now stands in Anonymous is as follows: 'Ἀντιφάνης μὲν οὖν Στεφάνου Ἀθηναῖος (*lacuna*) καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν μετὰ (κατὰ Mein.) τὴν Ση' Ὀλυμπιάδα. καὶ φασὶν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίας ἐκ Λαρίσσης, παρεγγραφῆναι δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείαν ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους, κτέ. Kaibel points out the *lacuna* before καί. It seems to me probable that the lost sentence gave the date of the poet's birth and read: 'Ἀντιφάνης ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τῆς Ση' Ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ. κτέ. If the original notice was in this form, it is easy to see how both the *lacuna* and the false date of the first appearance had their origin, and also how the corruption in Suidas arose.

Without going into the difficult question about the poet's birth-place, we now learn that the statement that Demosthenes made the proposal granting Athenian citizenship is chronologically quite possible. The date of his death may now be placed as late as 310. But the *Παρεκδιδομένη*, as we have seen, is generally placed after 307/6, on the authority of Diodorus 20, 53, who states that the title of βασιλεύς was not officially assumed by Seleucus until after it had been adopted by Antigonos. We know, however, that this title and its dignities were commonly bestowed upon this king by his subjects some time before they had been officially adopted for foreign intercourse.¹ There is no reason why the phrase τὴν Σελεύκου τοῦ βασιλέως ὑπεροχὴν (frag. 187, K.) should not have been employed by a comic poet to indicate the actual position of the ruler without regard to diplomatic usage. We are accordingly no longer obliged to suppose that Athenaeus wrongly attributed this play to Antiphanes or that the present text of the quotation is due to a later edition of the play. If Antiphanes was born in Ol. 98 (388-5), first exhibited in Ol. 103 (368-5), and died at the age of 74 years between 314/3 and 311/0, the internal evidence of the extant fragments is fully satisfied, the chronological data supplied by the list of victors and the Parian Chronicle are given their due weight, and the present text of Suidas and Anonymous, universally admitted to be corrupt, receives a satisfactory explanation.

¹ Droysen, *Gesch. des Hellenismus*, II 2, p. 141: "Bisher schon war Seleukos von den Barbaren König genannt und in morgenländischen Weise begrüßt worden."

Alexis.—Any new light on the life of Alexis, the greatest of the poets of the Middle Comedy, is peculiarly welcome. The notice which was once in Anonymus is now lost, and Suidas gives no chronological data. A victory at the Dionysia of 347 is recorded in CIA. II 971 g. The *Ἀγκυλίων* must have been produced before this time, for the verses preserved by Diogenes refer to Plato as still alive. The *Ἀποβάτης* was one of his earliest plays. On account of the reference to the poet Argas (fr. 19), who is mentioned also by Anaxandrides, Kock concludes that it was written ca. 468, but Kaibel is clearly right in objecting to this conclusion.¹ We are certainly safe in saying that none of the plays of which we have fragments need have been written before 350. On the other hand, a *terminus post quem* for his death is furnished by the fragment of the *ὑποβολιμαῖος*, in which the poet refers to Arsinoë, the sister-wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and to the treaty between Athens, Sparta, and Egypt whereby peace was re-established. The second marriage of Ptolemy was contracted before 273, and the treaty concluded somewhere between 271 and 265.² Kaibel accordingly dates this play ca. 270.³ If Plutarch, Script. Mor. 420 d, is interpreted literally, Alexis lived to be 106 years old. The date of his birth may accordingly be placed as early as 376.

In the Lenaeon list of victors the name of Alexis is four lines after that of Antiphanes, who, as we have seen, did not begin to exhibit until about 467. Accordingly, the first Lenaeon victory of Alexis may be placed about ten years later. This date, which of course can be considered only an approximation, is entirely in harmony with the known facts of his life as indicated above, and confirms the view of Kaibel that the date of the poet's birth as established by Meineke is much too early. Doubt may still be felt as to the authorship of the present version of the *ὑποβολιμαῖος*, but at any rate it is possible that it was written by the centenarian. The *Ἀρθίδης* was in all probability produced as late as 275, as I have tried to prove on the strength of CIA. II 975 h (Am. Jour. Arch. IV 1).

¹ See article in Pauly-Wissowa. Kock refers to Meineke, who, however, merely places the floruit of Argas ca. 368.

² Köhler on CIA. II 332. On the marriage see Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 138.

³ Bergk, Rhein. Mus. 35, p. 259, contends that the present text is due to a second edition of the play. But, as Kaibel has shown, the date of the poet's birth has been placed too early by Meineke (i. e. ca. 291). See Hist. Crit., p. 376.

367

The fact that Alexis was active as a playwright ca. 357 suggests an interesting coincidence, which, I trust, may be found to be not without some claims to probability. In the Parian Chronicle, 90-91, after an extensive lacuna, are the words: ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη ΠΔΔΔΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν Ἀγαθοκλέ[ους], i. e. in the year 357/6. The reference undoubtedly was to the first victory of some poet at the Dionysia. Now what poet could this be but Alexis? We know certainly of no tragic poet of prominence whose success in 356 could be thus signalled. Of the comic poets, Anaxandrides' first victory has already been mentioned, and that of Antiphanes was doubtless about a decade earlier. Of the other poets of the Middle Comedy, none but Alexis was of sufficient prominence to have been selected by the compiler of the Chronicle for special mention, which is accorded, apparently, to none of the poets of the New Comedy except Philemon and Menander. It is of course possible that the poet was a dithyrambic poet; but against this suggestion is to be urged the distinguished position which Alexis held in Athens during an exceptionally long career. I would accordingly propose the following restoration: [. καὶ Ἀλέξῃς ὁ κωμοιδόποιδος¹ τότε πρῶτον] ἐνίκησεν.

Menander.—In his commentary on the newly discovered fragment of the Parian Chronicle (Ath. Mitth. 22, 1897, p. 200), Wilhelm calls attention to the significant fact that Menander precedes Philemon in the catalogue of victors, but he offers no explanation. As our study of the victors' catalogues has shown, the explanation is simply this: the catalogue which we possess is the Lenaeon list, whereas the ancient authorities who place Philemon before Menander take into account only the events of the City Dionysia. We can not, however, place the first Lenaeon victory of Menander before 321, because the date of his birth² is given by CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1182, as 342/1; nor much later, because it is unlikely that the first Lenaeon victory of Philemon was gained more than six or seven years after his first City victory in 327. As regards the contradiction in the ancient notices concerning the date of the first City victory of Menander, Wilhelm rightly says that it was due to the confusion of two separate events—his first appearance in 321, in the archonship of Philocles, and his first victory in 315, under Democleides. I

¹ For the spelling cf. the new fragment of the Chronicle.

² Although this may be, as Kaibel believes, only the result of an estimate on the basis of the date of his first appearance.

think that the amalgamation of the two notices can be traced to its origin.

The chronographers mention the first competition of only one other dramatic poet. Under Ol. 77² the Armenian Version of Eusebius says: Sophocles . . . primum apparuit (Sync.: *πρῶτος ἐπεδείξατο*, Hieron.: primum . . . opera publicauit). Then under Ol. 78¹ the first victory of the same poet is indicated by the word *cognoscebatur* (Hieron.: *clarus habetur*).¹ As regards Menander, Hieronymus gives under Ol. 114⁴: Menander primam fabulam cognomento Orgen docens superat.² The language of Syncellus is: *πρῶτον δράμα διδάξας ἐνίκα*. Now just as the notice of Sophocles' first appearance is followed by another recording his first victory (unless we accept Plutarch's statement that Sophocles won at his first competition), so we should naturally expect to find in the chronographers under Ol. 116² (316/5) a reference to Menander's first victory. In fact, there seems to be a trace of such a notice in Eusebius, though only a trace. The Armenian Version contains this: Menander et Speusippus philosophi cognoscebantur. In Hieronymus, under the same date, we find: Menedemus et Speusippus philosophi insignes habentur, and similar in Syncellus. Before we had the testimony of the Parian Chronicle to a victory of Menander in 315, it was natural to regard the word *Menander* in Eusebius as a corruption of *Menedemus*. It will now, however, seem more probable that Menander belongs here, the rest of the sentence being lost. I believe that the combination of the two notices can most readily be explained if we assume that the second notice ran thus: *Μένανδρος <κωμικὸς πρῶτον, δράμα διδάξας Ὀργήν, ἐνίκα, καὶ Μενέδημος> καὶ Σπείσιππος οἱ φιλοσοφοὶ ἐγνωρίζοντο*. The preceding notice employed the words *πρῶτον ἐδίδαξε*. Now the first person who falsely construed *πρῶτον* with *δράμα* (cf. Hieron.: *primam fabulam*) or with *διδάξας* would be tempted at once to substitute the second notice for the first. For this reason I think it more probable that the *Ὀργή* was produced in 315 than, with Wilhelm, in 321.

EDWARD CAPPS.

¹ Euripides is wrongly included in the notice. The date should be 77⁴ (469/8) instead of 78¹, for Aeschylus won in this year. Plutarch, Cim. 8, makes Sophocles victorious at his first competition in 468. According to the Parian Chronicle he was 28 years old in 468, so that there is nothing improbable, at least, in the notice of Eusebius.

² Curiously corrupt in the Vers. Arm.: *Iêandrus primus uirtutem ostendit, superabat enim ὀργήν* (iracundiam).

IV.—THE WENZELBIBEL, COD. PAL. VINDOB. 2759-2764.

This, the most famous MS of the group called by Walther¹ "2. Zweig," comprises only the Old Testament, and that not quite complete. The MS is of parchment, and consists at present of six large folio volumes. A somewhat reduced facsimile of a page of the first volume is given by Walther opposite col. 296. The first volume contains the five books of Moses, and Joshua; the second, Judges, Ruth, and the four books of Kings; the third, Chronicles, Manasseh's Prayer, first to third Ezra, Tobias, and the first seven verses of Judith; the fourth, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Judith, Esther, Job, and the Latin introduction to the Psalms; the fifth, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song, Wisdom of S., Ecclesiasticus and Prayer of S.; the sixth, Isaiah, Jeremiah (without Lamentations), Baruch, Ezekiel. The MS is written in large Gothic letters. The literature is given by Walther, col. 291.

The material for the present paper was obtained in Vienna in the summer of 1898. Having occasion to examine the MS for the purposes of another investigation, I noticed that the MS had not as yet been accurately described as regards scribes and dialects, and therefore made notes and extracts which form the basis of this article. Recently, a book by F. Jelinek² has appeared, in which a considerable portion of my work has been anticipated. Jelinek first describes the MS and the scribes, points out certain errors of translation, and prints the prologue. He then discusses in order the various vowels and consonants, declension, conjugation, and certain syntactical phenomena. At

¹Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters, dargestellt von Wilh. Walther. Braunschweig, 1889-92.

²Die Sprache der Wenzelsbibel in ihrem Verhältnis zu der Sprache der wichtigsten deutschen Literatur- und Rechtsdenkmäler aus Böhmen und Mähren im XIV. Jahrhundert und der kaiserlichen Kanzlei der Luxemburger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache von Dr. Franz Jelinek. Görz, 1899. Selbstverlag des Verfassers. Pp. 110. Dr. Göldlin von Tiefenau, Kustos of the Imperial library, who has most kindly given me additional information on doubtful points, also first informed me of the appearance of the above article.

the same time comparisons are made with various Bohemian texts of the fourteenth century. Finally, the various dialectic phenomena are summed up, and the author concludes that the translation originated at the end of the fourteenth century, in the region to the north or northwest of Prague.

In so far as the above paper has anticipated the present one, the treatment will be very brief; other questions will be treated more in detail.

Four scribes contributed to the work, who change about fifteen times. The first scribe wrote the first two volumes, and 6 ff. of the third (Gen. to Paral. 4. 38). The text is decidedly Middle German, though the long vowels are generally diphthongized. The pronoun *er* often appears as *her*, the earliest place noted being Gen. 18. 19, in the first volume. This writing becomes more and more frequent in the course of the first and second vols., extending into the third. Jelinek, p. 72, cites instances only from the third volume. M.H.G. *û* generally appears as *ou*, most frequently in the words *ous*, *ouf*. This scribe never writes *aus*, *auf*, in this early portion at least. Sometimes even the undiphthongized vowel appears, as in *cziten*, *fruntschaft*, and still oftener in *us*, *uf*, though in the beginning this is rare. The old diphthong *ou* generally appears as *ou*, though later *au* appears. Flexional *i* is frequent; *ver-* uniformly appears as *vor-*; "rückumlaut" preterites are very frequent; *ie* often appears as *i*; the suffix *-lich* appears as *such*; the diphthong of *i*, as also the old diphthong *ei*, are written *ei*.

This scribe continues to vol. 3, f. 6^{verso}. Fol. 7^{recto} begins (I Paral. 4. 38): | -ret grossleich uñ sie ingiengen in gadar uncz zu dem aufgangk des tals.¹ This is by a Bavarian scribe (2), forms such as *tail*, *waid*, *aus*, *hawser*, *tragund*, *pergk*, *schoffen* (*ovibus*) *gewant* (= *o*), occurring on this page. The writing is larger, the ink blacker, illustrations and superscriptions are lacking, while they do occur on the pages immediately preceding and following. Fol. 7^{verso} is blank, with the exception of one line. F. 7^{recto} ends (I Paral. 5. 18): pogen zu dem streitt | and the verso contains: | vier und vierczigk tausendt. On f. 8^{recto} the first scribe sets in again, the line on f. 7^v being repeated thus: vier und vierczik tausentt und siben hundert und vierczik czihende

¹ I quote the text and places according to the Vulgate, where the various changes occur, as these are not given by Jelinek. Indeed the whole matter of the scribes is disposed of by him in less than a page.

zu streite. This repetition, which occurs at almost every change of scribes, generally gives an indication of the change of dialect, cf. *tausendt* : *tousentt*. Sometimes only one word is repeated; at others, nearly a whole sentence. The reason for this varying repetition is not yet entirely clear to me: Jelinek does not note these repetitions at all.

It is evident that fol. 7 was inserted later by the Bavarian scribe (2), who supplied a gap left by scribe 1. The omission by scribe 1 probably came about as follows:—Up to 4. 38, where the break occurs, the text consists entirely of an enumeration of the various families. With the next verse the narrative sets in, continuing to the end of the chapter. In the following chapter the enumeration of the families begins again, and continues to verse 18, where the narrative begins again. The scribe probably made a pause, and on commencing again found the place where the enumeration of the families ends, but in the fifth chapter, instead of the fourth. Jelinek assumes, p. 4, bot., that, along with others, this leaf had been lost and then replaced by the Bavarian scribe. If this were the case, we should expect both sides of the new leaf to be filled, and more than filled, for the writing on the new leaf is larger than that of scribe 1.

The first scribe, who sets in again f. 8^r, continues to the end of f. 128^v: Und hast uns gegeben ein solich wurtzen || (III Esdras 8. 88). On f. 129^r the Bavarian scribe (2) sets in again: | sölēiche wurcñ und haben wider umbgekert . . . Characteristic forms such as *vermischt*, *unraynigkait*, *aus*, *auf*, *junkchfrawn*, *waynund*, *weliben* (= *b*) (col. 1, l. 14), *nymbar* (= *w*) (l. 16), occur on this page; on f. 130: *pischolf*, *puech*, *grosleich*. (For *pischolf* cf. Weinhold, Bair. Gram., §159.) This Bavarian scribe (2) continues to the end of f. 136^v: chert auch gesunnter herwider zw uns und deine augenn | (= Tobias 5. 26). On f. 137^r the Middle German scribe (1) sets in again: | ougen werden yn sehen wene ich geloube . . .

This change of scribes helps to solve a question concerning the translation itself. Jelinek, it may be noted, does not mention the existence of any related MSS, whereas at least eleven exist; cf. Walther, col. 291. One of these, cgm. 341, may possibly be older than the Wenzelbibel. At all events, the other MSS do not descend from the Wb., but from some other MS now lost. This will be shown conclusively later on. In spite of these MSS Jelinek treats the Wb. as if it were a unique, original translation,

and merely refers to a "Concept," which in all the wanderings and vicissitudes of the MS remained with it, so that later, lost portions could be replaced by the Bavarian scribes! On p. 12 he asserts rather naively that a comparison with the second pre-Lutheran printed Bible proves this to be a different translation. It is thus evident that he is entirely ignorant of the work of Walther, who proved this fact nearly ten years ago.

In the matter of the text and scribes of the Wb., Walther, to be sure, is not very successful. In the first place, he fails to note the presence of the third book of Esdras, which in the MS continues the second book (Nehemiah) without a break or change in the superscriptions; at the end, f. 131^v, the scribe wrote: "alhie endt sich das ander puech Esdras," which, no doubt, also misled Walther. This confusion probably existed very early in the translation, and was not brought about by the scribe of the Wb., for the Maihingen MS to be quoted later also shares this confusion. Walther therefore states, col. 306: "Wunderbarerweise bietet die Wenzelbibel im Buche Tobias eine durchaus andere Uebersetzung als die übrigen Handschriften. Wir haben diese Partie von dem 2. Uebersetzungskreise auszuschliessen, und werden sie später als den fünften Zweig behandeln." Later, cols. 348-350, he treats the book of Tobias under the heading "5. Zweig."

Walther is unable to determine where this new translation has its beginning and end. During my stay in Vienna I was also unable to determine this, not being able to compare with the texts of the other MSS. Later, on comparing extracts from the Maihingen MS, from Tobias 8. 3-10, and 11. 3, which I had made for other purposes, I found that in these passages the Wb. agreed with the text of Maihingen and the rest, so that the return to the old translation in the Wb. must have taken place before this. The Bavarian scribe, as before noted, had stopped at f. 136^v = Tobias 5. 26, and I therefore suspected that the "5. Zweig" of Walther ended with this scribe, and probably also began with the same, III Esdras 8. 88. Dr. Göldlin v. Tiefenau kindly sent me a copy of the last lines of f. 128^v, and Dr. G. Grupp at Maihingen copied the corresponding portions of the Maihingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1, which belongs to the same group, but contains the uniform translation of Walther's "2. Zweig." A comparison of the two texts proved my conjecture to be correct. To the bottom of f. 128^v of the Wb. the two MSS agree almost letter for letter,

whereas from f. 129^r they are entirely different, as a glance at the annexed texts will show. This difference continues to f. 136^v incl. of the Wb., = Tobias 5. 26, and on the following page they again agree exactly. The new translation was therefore inserted by the Bavarian scribe (2), and extends from III Esdras 8. 88 to Tobias 5. 26, exactly 8 pp., a signature.

Cod. Pal. Vind., 2761, f^o. 128^v,
col. 2, ll. 23-36.
(III Esdras 8. 85 seqq.)

..... Und nu ewer töch-
ter nicht fuget zū iren Sunē
Und ire tochter nemet nicht
ewern sunen. Und süchet
nicht vride zu haben mit
yn alle czeit. so das oberwī-
dende esset die guten der
erden. Und teilet das erbe
ewern sunen untz bis ewi-
clich. Und was euch wider-
vert | das geschicht alles
durch ewer posen werk un-
durch ewer grossen sunde.
Und hast uns gegeben ein
apponatur: solich wurtzen
(End of f^o. 128^v.)

f^o. 129^{recto}, col. 1, l. 1.

soleiche wurczn̄ und ha-
ben wider umbgekert ze
übertreten dein saczung
das wir uns vermüschet
würden der unrāynnig-
kait des ausserlendischen
volckhs des daygen lan-
dts wirst du dann herr ich-
czürnen uns. und uns ze-
uerderben. Als langk daz
nicht beleib unser wurczn̄
und nam. Herr got israhel'
der du warhaftig pist. weñ
weliben ist dy warhaft
wurczn̄ ünczt auf den heu-
ttigen tag. Nymbar yeczūt
sey wir in unsern poszhait
ten vor deinem angesicht.
etc.

Maihingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1.

Und nu ewer tocht-
ter nit fuget zu iren sunen
und ir tochter nemet nicht
ewern sunen und suchet
nit fryde zu haben mit
yn alezit so das uberwin-
dende esset dy guten der
erden und teylet das erbe
ewern sunen uncz bis ewi-
glichen und was euch wider-
veret das geschicht alles
durch ewer pose werck und
dorch ewer gross sunde
und hast uns geben ein
semlich wurtzeln

und aber
wider sein wir wider gekart zu
ubertreten dein elichen werk
so das wir uns vormischten
der unreynigkeit fremder
heyden diser
erden.

nicht zurne uns
vorliesend uns uncz bis
nicht gelassen werd
unser czweigk und
unser nam. Herre got
warhafft bistu: wen
verlassen ist der
czweig bis in desen
heutigen tagk. Sich nu
sey wir in unsern sünden
in diner angesicht.
etc.

Cod. Pal. Vind. 2761, fo. 136^{verso},
col. 2, l. 3 to end of page.
(Tobias 5. 23 seqq.)

.. Und do sy nw fertig warn
do hueb an sein muter ze way
nen und sprechen zum vater
Nw hast du genomen dein
aufhaltung den stab unsers
alters und hast yn gesantt
von uns. Nymmer mer solt
sein das selbig gelt. Darumb
du yn gesantt hast. Genuegt
hyet vns vnser armut das wirs
geschäczt hietē fur reichtumb
So wir angesehē hietē unsern
sun. Do sprach zu yr Thobias
Du scholt nicht waynenn
unser Sun chumbt gesunt
ter do hynn Und chert au
ch gesunntter herwider zw
un und deine augenn

(End of fo. 136^{verso}.)

fo. 137^{recto}, col. 1, l. 1, etc.

ougen werden yn sehen. wē
ne ich geloube das der gute
engel gotes wander mit im
und schicke wol alle dink di
pei im werden gehandelt al
so das . . . etc.

Mailingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1.

.. und do sy hin geczogen waren
do begonde sein muter weynen
und sprechen den stap unsers
alters hastu
genūmen
und hast yn gesant
von uns das nicht were
das gelt nach dem
du yn gesant hast wen genuget
hett uns unser armūt und
als den reichtūme hetten wir ge-
achtet das das wir hetten gesehen un-
sūne Und thobias sprach zu ir [sern
nicht wein
gesund kumpt unss sune
herwider
zu uns
und deyn augen

werden in sehen und
ich glaub das der gut
engel gotes mit ym wander
und schicke wol alle dingk dy
by ym werden gehandelt al-
so das . . . etc.

Of this new translation III Esdras 8. 88–Tobias 5. 26 there are no further traces. To assume with Jelinek, pp. 4, 5, that this portion had been lost from the MS and replaced by the Bavarian scribe (2) is not possible, for the new scribe would not at all have been able in that case to gauge his work so as to fill exactly eight pages. We must assume that this portion was written before that which follows.

The Middle German scribe (1), who sets in again here, on f. 137^r, continues to the end of vol. 3, f. 144. This is another signature of 8 pp., and contains the rest of Tobias and seven verses of Judith. Thus far the order of the books has been that of the Vulgate; but the fourth volume, instead of continuing Judith, begins with Isaiah. This is the work of the Bavarian

scribe again, who continues to f. 10^v, only one-fourth of the verso being filled. In this section there are no illustrations. The first col. of f. 10^v ends, about half-way down the page: *wirt sy fressen und enczunt wirt in der dikche des waldes* (Isaiah 9. 18). The italicized words are by a later hand. The second column is blank, with the exception of the line at the bottom: *wirt id' dikche*. These are the work of the Bavarian scribe (2), and continue the sentence from *enczunt*. A later reviser inserted the same words above, immediately after *enczunt*. This later reviser was also a Bavarian, to judge from the form *dikche*.

On f. 11^r another scribe commences: *wirt si in der dicke des waldes und vorwandelt wirt si mit einander*. This scribe (3) is also Middle German, but different from (1), who consistently wrote *ous*, *ouf*, and sometimes *us*, *uf*, but never *au*, *aw*; this scribe (3) generally writes *us*, *uf*, sometimes *au*, but never *ou*, the most common form of (1). Other differences between these two scribes will be noted later. Scribe 3 has a strong admixture of Bavarian forms, such as *göldeiner*, *bawern*, *schawen*, *haus*, *mawer*; old *û* generally appears as *au*, *aw*, except in the words *us*, *uf*. This scribe continues through the "*gepete ieremie*," to f. 146^r, of which only one-third of a column is filled. The verso is blank. F. 147^r is also blank. With f. 147^v, at the top, another scribe (4), Bavarian, commences: *Hie hebt sich an das buch das do heisset Judith mit semelichen worten*. The page ends, *Judith 1. 7: und sein hercze wart.* | This scribe has *ai*, *ue*, *au*, even in *aus*, *auf*, which latter writing distinguishes him from both the Middle German scribes, while the absence of further Bavarian characteristics distinguishes him from the Bavarian scribe 2.

On f. 148^r the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, *Judith 1. 7: wart erhaben*. Here we have as a rule *ous*, *tousent*, but also *aus*, *tausent*. It is the same scribe 1, but the instances of *au* are more frequent.

The mixed state of affairs in the first part of vol. 4 is to be explained as follows: Vol. 3, it will be remembered, ended with *Judith 1. 7*, scribe 1, and f. 148 of vol. 4 forms the proper continuation of this, by the same scribe. By mistake the portion written by scribe 3, vol. 4, ff. 11-146, was inserted. Then the Bavarian scribe 2 added ff. 1-10 of vol. 4, in order to have *Isaiah* complete. Later, the Bavarian scribe 4 inserted f. 147, in order to have *Judith* complete. He copied this from vol. 3, f. 144, which had been written by the Middle German scribe 1, and this

probably accounts for the absence of further Bavarian characteristics, as the passage was not extended enough to enable him to get into the swing of his own dialect. That f. 147, and also ff. 1-10, of vol. 4 were inserted later, is shown by the fact that three-fourths of f. 10^v, as well as the whole of 147^r, are blank.

The Middle German scribe 1 continues from f. 148 to the end of vol. 4, f. 211. Volume 5, beginning with the Psalter, to f. 186 incl. is also the work of this scribe, though his language contains more Bavarian elements. At the beginning of vol. 5, before the Psalter, is a table of contents, beginning: "In dem gegenburtigen puech sind vermerkt die hernachgeben puecher . . ."; and the date, 1447. Dr. Göddlin von Tiefenau considers it possible that the scribe of this table of contents is the same as the one on f. 147, vol. 4, while Jelinek considers it almost certain that they are identical.

The Middle German scribe 1 continues to Ecclesiasticus 34. 24: angesichte des vaters. | On f. 187^r, vol. 5, the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in: | das prat der durstigen ist ein leben des armen . . . In this portion characteristic Bavarian forms occur, such as *dew* (= *die*), *gesuechet*, *chain*, *gedenkch*, *andrew*, *erwekch*, *schikch*, *gefolkleich*, *froleich*, *gebund*, *werich*, *verpirig*, *widerbertig* (= *w*), *weyroch*.

This scribe continues to the bottom of f. 192^v: si werdent wirtschefften in seine gepoten und | On f. 193^r the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, Ecclesiasticus 39. 37: | werden sie wirtschefften und ouf der erden in der notdurft werden sie bereitet . . . This scribe continues through vol. 5, into vol. 6. Through some mistake the rubric at the end of Ecclesiasticus reads *genant ist sprichwörter*. Vol. 6 begins with Isaiah, this time in the correct order of the Vulgate. Here the diphthong of *u* is generally written *au*, except in the words *ous*, *ouf*. Scribe 1 continues to the end of f. 123^v: von den steten iuda | (= Jerem. 34. 7). On the next leaf the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in again: | juda gemawrte stete das wort das do wart . . . This scribe continues to the bottom of f. 130^v, = Jerem. 40. 1: gefuert wurde gegen Babilon und das |. On the next leaf the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again: | babilon und das haus . . . He continues to the bottom of 138^v, = Jerem. 46. 2: den do |. On the next leaf the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in: | den do slueg nabuchodonasor kunig von babilō in dem virden iare . . . In this section are a number of instances of *vorlesen*, and other words with *vor-*, whereas in

other places this scribe generally uses the form *ver-*. The *vor-* must be from the Middle German original. The scribe continues to f. 152^v, = Jerem. 52. 34: *uncz bis an dē tage seines todes alle die tage seines lebens*. This is the end of the prophecy of Jeremiah, but the Lamentations are omitted. On the next page the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, with the book of Baruch: *hie hebet sich an di vorrede in das buch baruch*. The following forms occur: f. 153^r, *pristern, ous*; f. 153^v, *aus* (2), *tak*; f. 154^r, *gotis, wek, aus, iczleicher*; f. 161^v, *auf, gotis, dorin, vor-, wek*; f. 206^v, *aus*; f. 220^v, *ouf*, but *auf* more frequent. In this portion *au* is much more frequent than in the other sections assigned to this scribe, but it is reasonably certain that we have to do with the same scribe. This scribe continues to the end of f. 224, = Ezek. 45. 9: *gerichte gar un̄ |*. On f. 225^r the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in again: *| und tut gerechtikait*. The writing is quite different from the preceding. Characteristic forms occur, such as (f. 225^r) *gerechtikait, abschaidt, trukchner, subenten* (3), *moneids, gays-pokch*; f. 227^r, *dresigk, gankch*. This scribe continues to the end of the work, f. 231^r, middle of col. 1, the end of the book of Ezekiel.

Jelinek, p. 4, does not notice this last change of scribes, f. 224-225, and in fact assigns this whole section, ff. 153-231, to the Middle German scribe 3, whereas it is very clear that this scribe had nothing to do with either of these sections. In the first place, the writing on f. 225 shows that a change of scribes occurred there, which Jelinek overlooked. In the next place, the section 153-224 shows *ous, aus* exclusively, whereas in the portion really written by scribe 3, vol. 4, ff. 11-146, *us, uf* predominate, *aus, auf* occurring now and then, but never *ous, ouf*, which are the characteristic forms of scribe 1; Jelinek has recognized these differences, pp. 38-39, but has failed to take them into account here. Furthermore, as regards the last section, vol. 6, ff. 225-231, Jelinek's own testimony is sufficient to show that this belongs to the Bavarian scribe. On f. 225 alone three instances of *subenten*, for *sibenten* 'seventh,' occur, and Jelinek, p. 25, states: "*suben nur bei γ*" (= Bavarian scribe 2). In conclusion I may state that Dr. Gödlin von Tiefenau has compared the above delimitation of the various scribes with the MS, and his comparison sustains my conclusions.

The following list will give a comprehensive view of the extent of the work of the various scribes:

<i>Middle German scribe 1.</i>		<i>Bavarian scribe 2.</i>	
Vols. 1, 2=	240+182=422 ff.	Vol. 3, f. 7	= 1 f.
vol. 3, ff. 1-6	= 6	" ff. 129-136	= 8 ff.
" 8-128	= 121	vol. 4, 1-10	= 10
" 137-144	= 8	vol. 5, 187-192	= 6
vol. 4, 148-211	= 64	vol. 6, 124-130	= 7
vol. 5, 1-186	= 186	" 139-152	= 14
" 193-206	= 14	" 225-231	= 7
vol. 6, 1-123	= 123		
" 131-138	= 8	Total,	53 ff.
" 153-224	= 72		
Total,	1024 ff.		

<i>Middle German scribe 3.</i>		<i>Bavarian scribe 4.</i>	
Vol. 4, ff. 11-146	= 136 ff.	Vol. 4, f. 147	= 1 f.

As has already been mentioned incidentally, whenever there is a change of scribes, the old scribe ends on the *verso* of a leaf, while the new one invariably commences with a new leaf. Vol. 3, f. 7, not being filled, also vol. 4, ff. 1-10, were most probably inserted later by scribe 2, on discovering the gaps left by 1 and 3. Vol. 4, f. 147, was inserted much later by scribe 4. The rest of the work of scribe 2 must be considered as having been done at the same time as that of 1 and 3. The fact that in all these other cases—vol. 3, 129-136; vol. 5, 187-192; vol. 6, 124-130, 139-152, 225-231—the pages are full at every change of scribes, precludes the possibility of the assumption of Jelinek, pp. 4, 5, that these portions had dropped out of the original MS, and were replaced later by scribe 2. In this case we must assume that the original remained with the present copy, and also that the original had pages of exactly the same size as the present Wb.; otherwise the last page of the inserted parts would not have been full, as is shown by vol. 3, f. 7; vol. 4, f. 10, f. 147. Furthermore, the section vol. 3, 129-136, which contains the new translation, could not have been in the original, as in that case its limits would not have corresponded exactly with the limits of the scribe who wrote it. As the last page of this is full also, we must assume that it was written just after the preceding portion and just before the following.

A causal connection probably exists between the various changes of scribes and the repetitions occurring there, which are to be explained as follows: When scribe 1 stopped at vol. 3, 128, he underscored in the original the last two words that he had copied, as a sign for the following scribe. The latter then started with the underscored words, but thought he would continue with a translation of his own. At the end of his eight leaves he marked the place in the original which he had reached, and the next scribe copied the underscored word again. This process was repeated at each change. F. 152, vol. 6, ends with a book, Jeremiah, and consequently there was no repetition.

In the case of the portions inserted later, the reviser who compared the copy with the original in the same way underscored the last words of the part to be inserted.

The duplicate version of Isaiah and Jeremiah, in vol. 4, is entirely by scribe 3 (except the first ten ff., which were later added by 2), and this is the whole extent of the work of that scribe. It may be that this was intended for another copy, which has not come down to us, and was put into the Wb. by mistake, in place of the books following Ezekiel; or it may be that the scribe mistook a mark in the original and began at the wrong place.

Walther treats this question of the MS and the arrangement of the text, col. 291-294, but his treatment is very inaccurate. He states that there may have been different scribes at work, but where, he does not know—col. 294: "Es mag der mit dem Gebet Manasse beginnende Band auf mehrere Schreiber verteilt worden sein, von denen der zweite mit Judith begann, und der erste, ohne der ihm gesteckten Grenze sich zu erinnern, einfach seine Pergamentbogen vollschrieb, welche etwas mehr Raum boten als man vorher berechnet hatte." He refers then to the duplicate portion of Judith 1. 1-7, but his supposition is entirely erroneous, as the duplicate page is by scribe 4 and was inserted later. Furthermore, the *same* scribe (1) wrote the first part of Judith in vol. 3, and the continuation in vol. 4. There are indeed several scribes in the volume to which Walther refers, but not where he supposes them to be.

Concerning the two versions of Isaiah and Jeremiah he says, col. 292: "Ohne Zweifel aber ist jener erste Teil des 4. Bandes gar nicht ein Bestandteil der eigentlichen Wenzelbibel, sondern dieser nur aus Versehen einverleibt. Denn er ist mit anderer Tinte und von anderer Hand geschrieben als das Vorhergehende

und Nachfolgende; und die Schreibung der Worte ist meistens eine von derjenigen in den übrigen Teilen abweichende, obwohl die Uebersetzung im Grund genau dieselbe ist. So lesen wir in der wirklichen Wenzelbibel: zu, ouf, milch, vliessen, wenne, menige; hier dagegen öfter: czu, uff, milich, vlisen, wann, menke. Auch begegnen wir hier manchen Versehen, welche der 6. Band nicht kennt, und die man für Hörfehler halten möchte. So lautet Is. 1. 3 im 4. Bande: Der auch sy hat erchant die chripp, im 6. Bande aber richtig und in anderem Dialect: Der ochse hat erkannt die cripe." He is here unable to discriminate between two very different dialects in vol. 4, Isaiah, though he quotes from both—first *uff, vlisen*, then *erchant, chripp*;—he merely assigns the whole to a new scribe, writing in a new dialect.

Next he quotes two other slight inaccuracies in Isaiah, vol. 4, to show the difference between this text and that of vol. 6: *verstumten* in vol. 4 = *vertumten* in vol. 6, and *regel*, vol. 4 = *rogel*, vol. 6. These inaccuracies of vol. 4, all of which have been quoted above, are insignificant scribal errors and do not prove anything. He then shows by a single instance, Is. 60. 5, where vol. 4 has correctly *die menke des meres*, while vol. 6 has only *die menige*, that vol. 4 can not have been copied from vol. 6. Nowhere, however, does he eliminate or even mention the possibility that both texts may have been copied from one and the same MS, unless he takes the above-mentioned differences, which are the only ones that he gives, as sufficient to prove this, which is certainly not the case. He proceeds, nevertheless: "So sind denn die beiden Bücher Isaías und Jeremias im 4. Bande ein Teil einer zweiten Handschrift dieses Kreises und von der Wenzelbibel auszuschliessen. Genau genommen also würden wir sie als eine zwölfte Handschrift zu zählen haben." In this connection Walther also fails to note the fact that the duplicate translation of Jeremiah contains the Lamentations, while the other, in the sixth volume, does not. This fact alone would prove that the version in vol. 4 was not copied from vol. 6. By calling the version in vol. 4 the duplicate, and eliminating it, the MS would have an additional lacuna.

The agreements of the two texts, which Walther does not consider, are much greater than the differences, as may be seen by reference to the following table, which is by no means exhaustive, the instances being taken from extracts which were made for other purposes.

Table showing agreements between the two versions of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the Wenzelbibel.

	<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>The two versions in vols. 4 and 6 of the Wenzelbibel agree.</i>	<i>The other related MSS have different readings.</i>
Isaiah 2. 3	et ad domum Dei Jacob	zu dem hause goles hern iacobes	zu dem goltz hauss [des] herren yacobs
Is. 7. 6	regem in medio eius filium	Kunig den sun	Kunig in seiner mitte den sun
Is. 41. 1	ad iudicium	zu gerichte	mit gerichte
Is. 50. 8	stemus simul, quis est adversarius noster? accedat	mit einander ste wir, wer ist mein widersache, er trete czu	mit einander ste wir, wer wider- saget mir, wer ist mein widersache, er trette zu
Jerem. 8. 14	silere nos fecit	hat uns <i>sweigende</i> gemacht	hat uns sweigen gemacht
Jer. 35. 11	a facie exercitus Chal- daeorum, et a facie exercitus Syriae	angesicht des heres der siren und sein bliiben	angesicht des heres der Caldeer und von der angesicht des heres der siren
Jer. 51. 11	acuite sagittas	scherffet die <i>geschos</i>	scherpfet dye pfeyll

These instances in which the two texts of the Wenzelbibel agree, as against variant readings of the other MSS, are much more important than the differences quoted by Walther. Especially noteworthy are the omissions Is. 7. 6, *in seiner mitte*, and Jer. 35. 11, *der Caldeer und von der angesicht des heres*. The insertion, in all the other MSS, of the clause *wer widersaget mir*, is also significant, while the two texts of the Wb. follow the Vulgate. The change of *pfeyll* to *geschos*, Jer. 51. 11, and the order *hause gotes* as against *gotz hauss* also show the close relationship of the two texts under discussion. There is consequently no valid objection to the supposition that both were copied from one and the same MS.

The translation itself is doubtless of Middle German origin: Jelinek places it in Bohemia, in the vicinity of Prague, but he does not take into account the other MSS. The present MS is probably the oldest of the group, with the possible exception of the fragment cgm. 341. The earliest dated MS is Maihingen III D. 1, fol. 1 (1437). This also has strongly marked Middle German characteristics, as also the Weimar MS fol. 3-8, dated 1458, and the Nürnberg MS cent III, N 41-43, dated 1437-43. The MS at Nikolsburg I was unable to examine, as the official in charge was absent at the time of my visit.

The MSS of Walther's second subdivision, which have partly this text, partly a different one, are all late, and the Middle German characteristics have been obliterated, as they were written by Bavarian scribes: Cgm. 219-221, written 1463, by *Oswald Nott*, at *Tegernsee*; cgm. 502-503, written 1463, by *Georg Rörer*, at *Regensburg*; Maihingen 1, 3, D., fol. III, IV, written 1468, by *Georg Rörer*. Gotha MS 10 is closely related, but date and scribe are unknown. The Middle German origin of the translation is therefore established beyond peradventure.

V.—NOTES ON THE NEWLY DISCOVERED ELEGY
OF POSEIDIPPUS.

This elegy is printed by Diels in the *Sitzungsberichte der kön. Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1898, LIV). The numeration is that of Diels.

In v. 11 *φήμη τὴν ἠφίεντ' οἰκία τοῦ Παρίου*, if, as seems to be the case, an oracle of Apollo is meant, *Παρίου* may be an error for *Κλαρίου*. *ἠφίεντ'* seems to be *ἀφίεντ'*.

Vv. 12, 13 are so given by Diels:

CA NAXHCAI·
TOIHNE.XPHZONTΕΑΔΕΞΑΔΥΔΩΝΑ
ΦΩΝΗΝ ΑΘΑΤΗΝ ΩΝΑ ΚΑΙ ..ΤΕΜΟΙ

They are obviously in close connection with the former verse. Diels restores them, conjecturally, thus:

*τοίην ἐκχρήσαντ' (?) ἑὰτ' ἐξ ἀδύτων ἀναχρήσαι
φωνὴν ἀθανάτην, ὦνα, καὶ ἴετ' ἐμοί.*

A closer transliteration, perhaps, would be:

*τοίην εἰ χρήσαντ' ἑὰδ' ἐξ ἀδύτων ἀνὰ ῥῆξαι
φωνὴν ἀθανάτην, ὦνα, καὶ ἱλαθί μοι
ἱλατέ*

(qualis erat) uox quam ediderunt tecta Clarii, talem si placet tibi oraculi instar ex adytis rumpere uocem diuinam, nunc, o rex, rumpe et mihi faue. *ἱλατε* would perhaps be nearer, and would include the Muses as invoked (1-8) with Apollo. In the beginning of the elegy (1-8) they are summoned from Helicon, and in 9 he turns to Apollo.

V. 14 is thus presented by Diels:

ΙΔΕΤΙΝΟΝ
ΟΦΡΑΜΕΤΙΜΗCΩCΙΝΕΜΟΥCΗΔΟΝΑC

This may possibly have been

ὄφρα με τιμήσωσιν ἐφ' οὓς ἔδον αἰσι δ' ἔπινον

ut me honore prosequantur uiri ad quos comedebam, feminae quibus propinabam.

In v. 15 I see nothing to alter except ποιήμασιν, for which I would write ἐπ' οἷδμασιν:

πελλαίου γένος ἄμὸν ἐπ' οἷδμασιν ἦγον Ὀλύμπῳ.

The ancestors of Poseidippus had migrated from the Macedonian Olympus to Asia.

Vv. 18, 19 appear to me to have been originally

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν πάρνηθος αἰδῶνι λυγρὸν ἐφίξει
μνᾶμα· κατ' ἀχλὺν ἐὼν δάκρυα θερμὰ χέω
καὶ στενάχων ἠθεῖον· αἰεὶ δὲ φίλον στόμα ταρ[φύ]

ZE

πάρνηθος is for παρρηίδος of the tablet; ἐφίξει (Diels) for ΕΦΗ; μνᾶμα M.

is my conj. for νᾶμα of the tablet; θερμὰ (Diels) for ΚΕ.

V. 20 is more conjectural. Diels gives the reading of the tablet so:

TAP

KAICTENAXΩNAIEMONΔEΦILONCTOMA

On my view of the passage, the poet alludes here to a dead ancestor, who had either lived in the neighbourhood of Athens or become famous as a poet there: his decease had plunged Poseidippus in mourning, and tears. If I am right, the language is very like Catullus, LXV 10 sqq.:

Numquam ego te, uita frater amabilior,
Aspiciam posthac. At certe semper amabo
Semper maesta tua carmina morte tegam.

except that Catullus sorrows for a brother, Poseidippus for a kinsman of maturer years. In v. 20 ταρφύ might express the quick succession of tears which fall from the writer of the elegy as he recalls, in his obscure misery, a happier time.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

VI.—CATULLIANA.

A LETTER TO PROFESSOR ROBINSON ELLIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM, January 4, 1900.

Dear Professor Ellis:—

As I have seen an announcement that you have undertaken to issue a new edition of Catullus, I venture to send you a few notes of suggested emendations, the result of attempts made in spare moments to restore, on palaeographical lines, corrupt readings of the MSS. Perhaps it may be just worth your while to glance at them, though I do not presume to attach much importance to them.

I have taken the texts of the MSS G and O to work at, as those texts are, I believe, generally admitted to be the most valuable; and, in making conjectures for *literal* reconstruction of the words which appear to be corrupt, the readings of those MSS must be kept to, palaeographically, as closely as possible. The substitution of words which have no connection in palaeographical construction with the texts I should rule out of court.

II 8:

Credo ut cum gravis acquiescat ardor.

I think that the key lies in the awkward *ut*, and that herein is an indication of the ending of a 3d sing. verb. I suggest that *credo ut* is a misreading of *quaerit*. Suppose that one of the early MSS (the Verona MS, perhaps), from which G and O are derived, was a 6th-century MS written in Roman half-uncials; and that this passage was somewhat defaced. The scribe copying from it might have easily taken the *q* for a *c* and the first limb of a long *r*, and thus have turned *quaerit* into *credout*. Next, the misreading of *cum* from *quo* on the same lines would also be simple. The passage then would run:

Cum desiderio meo nitenti
Carum nescio quid libet iocari,
Et solaciolum sui doloris
Quaerit, quo gravis acquiescat ardor.

XI 11. I rather wonder that no one appears to have suggested

horribiles quoque ultimi
mosque Britannos.

Is the *quoque* too clumsy? The misreading of *q.* for *qq.* is obviously simple.

XXIX 20:

Hunc Gallie timet et Britannie.

I have independently conjectured *Nunc Gallie timetur et Britannie*; but I find that this reading has already been proposed, and has been rejected on account of the introduction of a spondee in the first foot. But is this fatal? This solution is palaeographically so simple. Suppose the line written thus:

nuncgallietimet'etbritannie,

the *ur* in *timetur* being indicated by an apostrophe, an ordinary mark of abbreviation. Nothing more simple than for a copyist to have mistaken the apostrophe merely for a mark separating the two adjacent *et*'s.

If this reading were allowed, I would also change *hunc* into *nunc* in line 21. Does it not seem rather absurd that two persons should be asked why they pamper one of themselves? In your commentary you seem to recognize the weakness of the 2d plural verb being addressed to Caesar and Mamurra in connection with *hunc*.

XXIX 23:

Eone nomine urbis opulentissime.

I feel pretty certain that the key here lies in the word *urbis*. Commentators generally have attacked *opulentissime* alone, and have accepted *urbis*. *Opulentissime* is such a monstrous word, that the scribes could only have twisted it out of something, much defaced, which looked like it. I believe that, having misread the preceding word or words as *urbis*, they fitted on *opulentissime* merely as a possible epithet. The correct reading should obviously be something abusive of the *Socer generque*—and the weakness of *urbis* has been noticed.

Do you think that *o bis improbissimi* would be possible?

I have no doubt that the original word misread as *opulentissime* had a letter with a long stroke below the line (*p*), and one with a tall stroke above the line (*b*, *h*, *l*). Therefore, *improbissimi* is not impossible.

Believe me,

Yours very truly,

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories, by CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, IX, 1898.)

In No. IX of the Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Bennett subjects my theories regarding certain uses of the Latin subjunctive to much illuminating criticism, and points out a few inaccuracies of which I have been guilty in matters of detail. I never find any great satisfaction in discussing syntactical questions which there is reason to believe can never be definitely settled; and, at first sight, it would now seem that we here have to do with just such questions. The personal equation seems sometimes to cause no end of trouble even in the field of syntax. Delbrück, for instance, regards my theory that questions of obligation or propriety like *cur non laeter?* developed from the Indo-European optative, as established beyond all possible doubt (Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 389)¹; Bennett regards this theory as without the slightest foundation to rest upon (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. IX, pp. 1-30). Again, Geddes (Classical Review for Oct. 1898, p. 355 ff.), after an independent investigation of the entire field covered by my discussion of the Latin prohibitive, and after extending this investigation also through the period of Silver Latin (a period not covered by my own investigation), says that his results for all periods are "largely confirmatory" of my own conclusions.² Bennett, on the other hand (pp. 48 ff.), after a careful examination of Plautus, regards these conclusions as quite groundless. When authorities reach conclusions so diametrically opposed to each other, after a study of exactly the same material, it might well seem useless to hope that, without new material to work with, conclusions could be reached that would be generally accepted. I venture to believe, however, that some of the more important differences between Bennett's views and my own are more apparent than real. This is certainly true as far as my theory regarding the force of tenses in the prohibitive is concerned, and the primary purpose of the present article is to make my position

¹ This view has also been adopted in the new edition of Harkness' Latin Grammar (§557).

² Since the above was written, Professor Clement, who has made a careful examination of my theory as applied to Silver Latin, has published (Proceedings of the Am. Phil. Ass. XXX, p. xxxvi) statistics showing that my claim regarding the energetic force of *ne* with the perfect subjunctive in earlier times holds good for that period also.

on this point clearer than I seem to have done in my original discussion. There are, to be sure, here and there a few real differences between Bennett and myself in our interpretations of certain passages. For instance, in Merc. 113 Bennett regards *caue praeuorteris* as "merely a mild self-exhortation," instead of an emotional prohibition, as I claimed it was. I am at a loss to know how Bennett can justify his interpretation. At the moment of uttering this prohibition, the speaker, intensely excited, is in such headlong haste to get to his master that he is gasping for breath (114), has burst his lungs, as he claims, and is spitting blood (138), threatens to knock over every one that gets in his way (115-116) and fight him (119), if need be. Finding that his knees are failing him, he cries out "*perii! perii!*" (124-125). A moment later (130) he threatens to knock the door into splinters. Furthermore, the act involved in the prohibition *caue praeuorteris* is the very act through fear of which he is so greatly agitated. Is one to look for "mild self-exhortation" under such circumstances as these? In several other passages Bennett's interpretation seems to me equally improbable (see below). But, apart from a few details of this nature, the seeming differences between us, so far as I can see, are due to the fact that Bennett has misunderstood what my theory really is. He seems to think that I claim that, whenever a person is aroused from any cause whatever, he uses the perfect in making a prohibition, quite regardless of the character of the act itself that is involved in the prohibition. I make no such claim as that. The emotion, or earnestness, which I claim lies in the prohibition comes from alarm, indignation, or the like, caused by a fear (real or pretended) that the act prohibited will take place. If this act itself is of such a character that no particular harm would be likely to result from its performance, I should not expect the perfect to be used (however much excited the speaker might be from other causes), except in those rare instances where energetic utterance is purposely affected for some reason. To illustrate: if, in reply to a threat of punishment, some one excitedly says '*Don't strike me!*' I should expect the perfect tense. In fact, one would have to search a long time for an instance of the present tense used in such an answer (see comments on Epid. 595, below) to such a threat. On the other hand, just such cases are not uncommon among the instances of the perfect tense. In every such case, if the prohibition is not complied with, the speaker will be made aware of the fact by some disastrous result. To show the contrast between such a prohibition as this and one in which an excited speaker uses the present tense, let us take the passage found in Rud. 968 *hunc homo feret a me nemo: ne tu te speres potis*, a passage cited against me by Bennett. I quite agree with Bennett that the speaker here is excited; but I do not see any reason for uttering *ne speres* with greater emphasis, or energy, than any other unemphatic word, or phrase, in the sentence, e. g. than *feret* or *potis*. Indeed, all of

the emphasis is upon *tu* and *te*. This would be made flat and ridiculous by translating 'For God's sake *don't* you hope (or, don't you *hope*) that you can!' It means merely 'Don't *you* hope that *you* can!', with no emphasis whatever upon the *speres*. Whether the act of hoping takes place or not, is in reality a matter of no particular concern to the speaker. Indeed, the interests of the speaker are so little involved in the act of hoping that he will never even so much as know whether the prohibition is complied with or not, unless some one takes pains to tell him. The present tense is exactly what my theory demands here. *Ne speraueris* is probably unknown to the Latin language,¹ and in my Latin Prohibitive I lay the utmost stress upon the rarity of the perfect tense with verbs of this class. Indeed, the scarcity of the perfect and the frequency of the present with such verbs form one of the main grounds for my theory. I can imagine a situation under which I should expect even such a prohibition as 'Do not think!' to take the perfect tense. If, for instance, a girl were inclined to think her betrothed guilty of some disgraceful deed and threatened to dismiss him as a result of this suspicion, and if he were passionately pleading with her to believe him innocent, I should expect him to use the perfect tense in saying '*Do not think me guilty!*'; for her thinking so would mean the ruin of his happiness. Wherever the failure to heed a prohibition *even of a purely mental act* would be fraught with serious consequences either to the speaker or to some other person in whom the speaker takes a deep interest, my theory would lead one to expect the perfect tense. But it happens that no such condition of things is found among the instances of *ne* with verbs of mental activity, except *irata ne sies* in Am. 924 (see further comments upon this passage below).

I find that more than one reader of my original discussion have understood my position to be substantially that which Bennett has attributed to me. I am, however, considerably consoled by the fact that most of my reviewers have not misunderstood me. In re-reading my discussion, I still fail to see how any one can get the impression that my theory concerns *merely* the mood of the speaker without any reference to the character of the act prohibited, to the speaker's attitude toward that particular act, and to the results that will follow a failure to comply with the prohibition. I can, to be sure, detect a lack of clearness in two or three sentences I use referring to the context in which prohibitions stand, but in laying down the fundamental principles with which

¹ In Luc. Phars. 8, 451 both the MSS and editors are divided between *nec speraueris* and *ne speraueris*. In view of the usage elsewhere, there can, I think, be little doubt that *nec* is here the correct reading. Still, I can not vouch for the entire absence of such uses as *ne speraueris* from the period of decline. Professor Clement has kindly called my attention to *ne inuideris* (Val. Flac. 5, 507 and Plin. Ep. 6, 17, 4), *ne expectaueris* (? Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 32), and *ne credideris* (Curt. Ruf. 7, 8, 29).

I start as the sole foundation of my whole theory and upon which alone that theory depends, I am so explicit that I might fairly expect everything that follows to be interpreted in the light of those fundamental principles. When I appeal to the context, it is only for the purpose of getting side-light where side-light is needed for the clearer understanding of the speaker's attitude toward the act of the prohibition itself. With a prohibition like *ne speres* such a side-light is never (or, at least, seldom) needed; with one like *ne feceris*, such a side-light is *always* needed, since, without the context, one can never know whether the act involved is one of particular importance or not. As the fundamental conception upon which my whole theory rests, I claim (pp. 138-139 [6-7]) that the difference between *ne feceris* and *ne facias* is, that *ne feceris* is used of an act which must be prevented at all hazards; it implies that the speaker can not abide the thought of its happening; while *ne facias* is used when the speaker is taking a comparatively calm, dispassionate view of the prohibited act. Regarding this distinction my words are as follows (p. 139 [7]): "*I wish to insist upon this (feature of the perfect tense) as the only real distinction between the two tenses with ne.*" After elaborating this idea, that the choice of tense depends upon the character of the act as viewed by the speaker, I account for the predominance, in the present tense, of verbs indicating mental activity, in the following language: (p. 146 [14]): "If my distinction between the two tenses is correct, we should expect that a prohibition dealing with mere mental action, e. g. 'Do not suppose,' 'Do not be surprised,' 'Do not be afraid,' *would commonly take the present tense, because, . . . as far as the interests of the speaker are concerned, it matters little whether the prohibition be complied with or not.*" As the acts involved in such prohibitions are in their very nature of such a character that the thought of their occurrence would not ordinarily alarm the speaker, or arouse him to vigorous utterance, I claimed them forthwith as supporting my theory. I did not under these circumstances think it worth while to consider whether the speaker in any given case was, or was not, aroused from some cause not connected with the prohibition, for the reason that the question whether he was, or not, did not have the slightest essential bearing upon the application of my theory to the prohibition of acts of this character. Though the points above indicated are the essential points in my theory—constitute, in fact, all there is in the theory—Bennett seems oftentimes to have left them wholly out of consideration, and to have classified his instances merely according to the presence, or absence, of "special excitement" on the part of the speaker, without any regard whatever to the importance of the act prohibited. I may note, in passing, that Bennett makes too much out of the word 'excitement.' A desire for mere energetic utterance, without excitement, plays quite as important a part in my theory as does excitement. How, for instance, can any one get the impres-

sion from what I say on p. 139 (7) that I consider Cato 'excited' when he uses the perfect tense? The only explanation of these uses suggested by me is the importance, to Cato's mind, of the particular act prohibited, and a consequent desire to lay stress upon it. Furthermore, Bennett argues without any reference to the inherent probability of the existence of some distinction between the two tenses. Even Delbrück, with his own theory, admits (Vergl. Synt. II, p. 383) that the distinction I draw would be a natural one to expect incidentally. The proper attitude, it seems to me, would be to assume some distinction wherever we possibly can and reject it only when we are absolutely obliged to. If any one sets out to claim that there is no distinction between two different tenses, the burden of proof is certainly wholly upon him.

I trust that I have now succeeded in making clear what I consider to be essential in my theory of the distinction between the two tenses. As a fair test of the correctness of the theory, let all these prohibitions be divided into two classes—(1) those in which non-compliance will be disastrous or shocking, and which would therefore naturally be uttered with unusual energy, or earnestness; and (2) those of such a sort that it is a matter of no particular consequence to one's interests whether they be heeded or not, or of such a sort that no particular alarm is felt through fear that the prohibited act will be performed. When the particular act that is prohibited is of such a character that it falls *clearly* under one of these two classes, it is not necessary to take into consideration the context in which the prohibition stands. If a speaker were to adopt an emotional tone in prohibiting a commonplace act, he would make himself ridiculous, and arouse laughter instead of sympathy. However, in classifying according to the nature of the act prohibited and the speaker's attitude toward that act, there is room for errors. Even when a person is prohibiting an act which, if performed, would bring disaster, he may for some reason purposely soften his tone and use the less energetic form of prohibition; on the other hand, when he is prohibiting an indifferent, or a commonplace, act, he may as a bit of pleasantry, or from some other motive, adopt an emotional, energetic tone. This last might be expected to be especially common in comedy and other colloquial styles. But, on the whole, the general results of such a classification as I have indicated may be regarded as trustworthy.

If all the instances be divided into the two classes just indicated, it will be found that the instances of the present tense, with extremely rare exceptions, fall into one class, while those of the perfect tense, with few exceptions (comparatively), fall into the other class. In making this classification I am quite ready, for the sake of the argument, to exclude all those instances of the present tense which Bennett regards as subordinate, though many, if not most of them, are commonly regarded as genuine prohibitions. We must now further omit *ne attigas* from the list of

presents as being an aorist (see, for instance, Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, p. 464). Finally, we may omit *ne molestus sis*, which, in most cases, may be regarded as subordinate with as much confidence as many of those clauses which Bennett insists upon so interpreting; in any case, it is merely a stereotyped phrase (originally a mild 'Don't bother,' or 'lest you bother'), in which the tense was no longer specially chosen each time the phrase was used—the tense was inseparable from the phrase. This fact is recognized even by Seyffert (*Bursian's Jahresber. über die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft*, 22, p. 338), whom surely no one will accuse of being unduly partial to my theory.¹ In fact, this is about the only one of my contentions that he seems willing to accept. If this phrase were included, it would not materially affect our conclusions, as it is commonly prompted by trivial circumstances. Most of the remaining instances of the present are on much the same footing as *ne speres* mentioned above. Of all the instances, with one exception, in which the verb is one denoting mental activity (and these form a very large proportion of the entire number), we may simply say that the result of a failure to comply with the prohibition has so little bearing upon the speaker's interests that, as in the case of *ne speres*, he will never so much as know whether his prohibition is complied with or not. These of course may be at once omitted from further consideration. We may also omit from consideration all those instances which Bennett himself classifies as calm, commonplace prohibitions. Confining ourselves to the most emotional instances which Bennett has been able to cite, let us apply our test by asking regarding each, 'What will be the result of non-compliance with the prohibition?'

Capt. 947 *ne duis* ('you needn't give'). The person addressed will pay the speaker money for a slave instead of accepting him as a gift. It would be absurd to translate this 'for Heaven's sake, *don't* give!', as though the prohibition involved anything of importance.

Stich. 320 *ne cures*. The person addressed will try to play the agreeable by asking such innocent questions as 'Where have you been? What have you there?' Here again '*Don't* care!' or '*Don't care!*' would be absurd translations.

¹ Seyffert has understood my theory, but he rejects it for the insufficient reason that he finds a few instances that seem to him out of harmony with it. His proper method would have been to apply the test to all instances. After doing this, it would then have been in order for him to make whatever comments he chose upon any instances that seemed to him exceptions to my rule. Such exceptions could not have been many. I do not appreciate the force of his argument when he cites against me Bacch. 597 *mihi cautio, ne nucifrangibula excussit ex malis meis*. As if the idea 'lest he knock my nutcrackers out of my jaws' did not admit of energetic utterance! Similarly, *metuo ne defuerit oratio* means 'I fear lest words suddenly fail me'; *desit* would mean merely 'be wanting.' Seyffert further is forced to use against me *nil* with the perfect subjunctive, a use with which my theory regarding *ne* has nothing to do.

- Ib. 568, 713 *ne me territes*. The person addressed will try to frighten the speaker. Here, as I have pointed out in 'The Latin Prohibitive,' the feeling is not that the failure to comply with *ne territes* will be disastrous to the speaker, but rather that it will do the person addressed no good to try to frighten him. No one would think of translating this 'don't frighten me!' or 'don't *frighten* me!'. It means rather 'don't frighten *me*!', i. e. 'don't try to frighten *me* (for you can't do it)'. Clearly, then, this prohibition is not prompted by any fear of the performance of the act indicated by *territes*. Bennett here, as elsewhere, missed my point in commenting on my remarks.

If we were thus to go through the entire list of the most emotional prohibitions cited by Bennett, the result would in nearly every case be the same. The only possible exceptions are *Amph.* 924, *Trin.* 267, *Capt.* 548, *Men.* 789. But in the first of these *irata sies* may possibly be felt as the perfect of *irascor* (though this perfect is undoubtedly extremely rare). The second might well be taken as subordinate, depending upon *habeto*, in which case there should be only a comma after this word. As regards the third, there is hardly an instance among all those which Bennett insists (pp. 58 ff.) upon taking as subordinate that is more naturally so taken than this very clause; the sense would then be '(I say this) lest,' etc. Similarly, *ne observet* in *Men.* 789 may be taken as parallel with *ut geras* and dependent upon *monstravi*. Among the prohibitions classed by Bennett as not emotional are found two instances of the present, where non-compliance might be regarded as detrimental to the speaker's interests, viz. *ne duas* (*Merc.* 401) and *caue fidem fluxam geras* (*Capt.* 439).¹ As regards the present tense, then, our results may be summed up as follows:—Out of some 68 instances there are only two sure cases of prohibition where non-compliance would be particularly detrimental or disastrous, and these two cases Bennett himself regards as calm and commonplace in tone.

If, now, we apply the same test to the instances of the perfect tense, we get a very different showing. Here non-compliance with the prohibition will involve the following consequences:² *death* (or *threats of death*), in *Epid.* 148, *Aul.* 744, *Merc.* 484, *Poen.* 1023 (cf. 1025 f.), *Mil.* 1333 (a case of fainting); *loss of valued treasure* or *danger thereof*, in *Rud.* 1155 (cf. *perii* in same line), *Curc.* 599

¹*Ne me deseras* in *Mil.* 1363 can not be included here; see 'The Latin Prohib.' (*Am. Journ. Phil.* XV 2, p. 145; Reprint, p. 13). Similarly, *caue praeterbitas ullas aedis* (*Epid.* 437) involves nothing of any importance, though the *caue rettuleris*, in 439, does (see below).

²In examining the passages referred to, one should keep in mind the fact that extravagant or energetic address always invites a reply of a similar tone. One need not therefore be surprised to find threats of murder, suicide, or the like, answered by the use of the perfect tense, even when the threats are not seriously meant.

(the parasite is escaping with the stolen ring), Aul. 100, Aul. 585 (ne immutassis nomen = 'do not play me false.' Bennett says this "entire passage is one of calm confidence." It seems to me rather that Euclio is constantly beside himself for fear that the gold will be lost. He has so little real confidence in Fides, and such fear of her betraying him, that he implores her again and again (with the perfect subjunctive) not to do so; cf. 585, 608 (the first words he utters after 586), 611, 614. Everything depends upon Fides. The *non metuo* in 609 is used not with reference to Fides' betrayal, but with reference to some person's finding the gold without such betrayal, i. e. it contrasts *inueniat* with *indicassis*. Euclio's actions and words betray at every turn serious fear that Fides will betray him. And a little later (624-660) he feels so sure that she *has* betrayed him that he can not be convinced to the contrary till he actually gets hold of his treasure again. It would be difficult to conceive of any one more frantic over anything than Euclio is in 624-660 over the mere suspicion that Fides has played him false. The energetic tense here is exactly what I should expect from such a character as Euclio, whose anxiety about his gold is his ruling passion), Mil. 1245, Bacch. 1188, Aul. 608 (see remarks above on 585), Aul. 618, Vid. 91; *personal violence, flogging, etc.*, in Pers. 793 (cf. 780 ff.), Mil. 1125, Cas. 404, Trin. 1012 (The speaker is so wrought up over his danger that he calls upon himself to hurry five times within five lines in order to save his *scapulae* (1009) and escape the ox-whips (1011)), Truc. 943; *betrayal and torture*, in Mil. 862 (cf. 859); *ruin and disaster*, in Trin. 521 (cf. 524, 525, 526), Men. 415, Trin. 555 (If the person addressed *does* tell, the speaker will get a flogging, alluded to in *tu hercle et illi et alibi*, for balking his master's scheme, and both he and his master will be deprived of the only thing upon which their support depends; for, after learning the truth, Philo will take the land. Cf. 595), Bacch. 910 (the speaker's son will continue unrebuked his life of debauchery, which has just involved the latter in trouble, disgrace, and financial loss), Cist. 300; *starvation*, in Trin. 513; *insults to the speaker and his mistress*, in Asin. 625; *balking of carefully laid plans*, in Most. 1097 (a moment later, in 1108, the speaker ejaculates that he is ruined, and he threatens (1114) to set fire to the altar and burn the fellow off. Bennett says that an energetic prohibition would be "certain to defeat the object which he hopes to realize" and that the tone "can only be one of gentle coaxing." But I fail to see why "gentle coaxing" would not be as likely to defeat the speaker's purpose as an energetic protest. Any explanation that would make the former seem natural would make the latter seem equally natural. Furthermore, irascible people are very likely to defeat their own ends at such games by uncontrollable outbursts. The speaker, by the way, explains his earnestness in the next verse, in a way calculated to allay all suspicion), Mil. Gl. 1368 (Energetic utterance would arouse no suspicion,

as the speaker with the next breath attributes his utterance to anxiety for his master's welfare. The conceit of the captain would be sure to take this anxiety as sincere), Mil. 1371 (see remarks on 1368), Most. 401; *pursuit by ghosts*, in Most. 523; *escape of a lunatic*, in Men. 994 (Here *caue flocci fecerit* is not an expression of mere mental activity; it means 'let no threat prevent you from carrying the lunatic to the Doctor'); *danger to the chastity of the speaker's daughter*, in Epid. 400 (cf. 404-405); *disappointment in love*, in Merc. 401, 402, Epid. 439 (the present subjunctive *caue praeterbitas ullas aedis* occurs in 437, but not so much depends upon a compliance with this prohibition; it was not important that he should stop at each house—an absurd performance and one unnecessary to the accomplishment of his purpose; the only thing of importance was to find where *Periphanes* lived, and a failure to comply with *caue rettuleris* would mean a failure to do this); *delay of important information*, in Merc. 113 (see my remarks above on this passage); *imparting of distressing information*, in Vid. 83; *shocked modesty*, in Mil. Gl. 283 (pretended resentment at immodest allusions are extremely common in Plautus); *wounding of loved one's feelings*, in Cist. 110 (depth of feeling moves hearers to tears; cf. 112); *failure to rescue master from a dilemma or mistress from grief*, in Asin. 256 (furthermore, the speaker will get a flogging that has been promised him; cf. 363 and 315), Stich. 285 (Here again *caue flocci feceris* is not an expression of mere mental action, but means 'let no one interfere with you').

The instances just given comprise 43 out of the 58 instances of the perfect to be found in Plautus. We have already found, then, that nearly all of the 68 instances of the present tense fall into one of the two classes into which I have divided prohibitions, while more than 74 per cent. of the instances of the perfect fall into the other class. This condition of things in itself, whatever might be the character of the remaining 15 instances of the perfect, is enough to establish in a general way the distinction I have drawn between the two tenses. But even the remaining 15 instances of the perfect are not necessarily unfavorable to, or even exceptions to, my theory. In fact it will be found that some of them support it in the most decided manner. All that my theory claims is that the perfect tense is the tense of energetic utterance. While such utterance would be commonly confined to the prohibition of an act the result of which, if performed, would be detrimental to one's interests, or shocking to one's feelings, and while such a classification forms perhaps the best general basis for classification, it does not at all follow that prohibitions may not be occasionally uttered with unusual energy, from other causes than from a fear of the results of the act involved. In fact, some of these 15 instances are certainly characterized by energetic utterance (as admitted by Bennett himself). The very large proportion of the instances of the perfect in which that tense clearly indicates

energetic utterance creates an assumption in favor of a similar interpretation of the remaining cases; and the probability of the correctness of this assumption is still further established by the fact that the present tense, as has been shown above, is almost exclusively confined to commonplace prohibitions, in which energetic prohibition of the particular act involved would be without point, and frequently absurd. Let us see, then, how far it seems natural to assume energetic utterance as characteristic of these remaining instances:

Epid. 595 *ubi noles, ne fueris pater*, 'when you don't want to be my father, for Heaven's sake *don't!*' This is the reply of Acropolitis to Periphanes' threat that he will kill her if she ever calls him father again. Energetic threats, whether seriously meant or not, always invite energetic replies. Prohibitions which are thus used in replying to dire threats and in the translation of which one naturally puts the emphasis upon the prohibition itself (e. g. '*Don't* do that!' or '*Don't do* that!') never, I believe, take the present tense, while numerous examples of the perfect tense in such prohibitions have been cited above.

Truc. 606 *istuc ne responsis*. This involves a threat prompted by a defiant reply to the speaker, who is very angry and threatens to cut the former into bits if he adds another word. The words really mean 'Don't you *give* me such an answer as that, or, if you do, take the consequences.' Failure to comply will thus involve disaster to the person addressed. A prohibition which in this way involves a threat of disaster that will befall through failure to comply with it, never takes the present tense, so far as I have noticed; and this again is in strict accord with my theory.

Pers. 572 *ne sis ferro parseris*. If the speaker does not persuade the person addressed to act upon his advice, his deeply laid plot will come to nothing, and heavy loss will result. The *ne . . . parseris* may perhaps be used as an expression calculated to impress the person addressed, a procurer, with the exceptional value of the girl that the speaker wants him to buy. Every line of this speech is extravagant in tone. Excitement is not present, but energetic and extravagant utterance abounds along here at every turn.

Trin. 704 *id me commissurum ut patiar fieri ne animum induxeris*. The words of both Lesbonicus and Lysiteles along here seem to me brimful of emotion. See my comments below on this passage.

Asin. 839 *ne dixis istuc*.—*Ne sic fueris*, 'for Heaven's sake, don't *be* so!'

Epid. 723 *ne attigas*, 'don't *touch* me!' This is the surly reply of Epidicus, who thus shows his resentment at having been unjustly bound.

Pseud. 79 Eheu.—Eheu? idquidem hercle ne parsis, 'for Heaven's sake, *don't* be backward about asking for that!'

Poen. 553 nos tu ne curassis. Not merely in 541, but again in 571, the *advocati* are accused of being exceedingly angry, and both times on account of their spiteful language. Bennett would contend, then, that the *advocati* may fly into an angry passion, and use spiteful language, twice inside of three or four minutes, and that during the other two or three minutes there is "no vestige" of such a mood or tone. The tone of the *advocati* from the beginning of the scene has been for the most part surly.

Ib. 993 ne parseris, 'show him no *mercy*!' i. e. 'get out of him all the particulars.'

Asin. 467 caue supplicassis. Bennett himself regards this as uttered with emotion.

How far the assumption of energetic utterance in these 15 instances seems unnatural or impossible must be left to the judgment of my readers. To me it seems neither unnatural nor impossible. If, however, in any one of these passages such an assumption were to be regarded as impossible, then it might be set down as an exception to the rule, which would, to my mind, in no way destroy the validity of the general distinction I have drawn.

It will be noticed that I have in the above classification concerned myself solely with the instances of *ne* and *caue*. The other instances cited by Bennett are not instances of *ne*, or *caue*, and have been shown to have wholly distinct characteristics.¹ In 'The Latin Prohibitive' I laid the utmost emphasis upon the fact that my theory applied only to prohibitions expressed by *ne* and *caue*, and that instances of the perfect subjunctive with *nec*, *ne . . . quidem*, etc., lay entirely outside of its range of application. Curiously enough, my theory has been taken completely out of my hands, extended so as to cover phenomena to which I said in the most emphatic language it could not possibly apply, and then instances of these latter phenomena have been cited against me as though opposed to my own theory. I am more than ready to admit that most of the instances of *nec*, *ne . . . quidem*, *nihil*, *nullum*, *numquam*, with the perfect subjunctive, are at all periods of the literature dis-

¹ Whatever explanation be adopted for the perfect subjunctive after *nec*, *ne . . . quidem*, *nihil*, *numquam*, etc., it is an indisputable fact that its use with these words differs in a very marked degree in almost every respect from its use with *ne*; e. g. (1) with *ne*, it is never used in dignified, deferential address; with the other particles, it is very common in such address; (2) with *ne*, it is seldom used with verbs indicating purely mental action (at least before the end of the Augustan period); with the other particles it is used chiefly with just such verbs; (3) with *ne*, it is entirely unknown to many productions in which with the other particles it is common. Even if all the instances with *nec*, *ne . . . quidem*, etc., were to be recognized as true volitives, my theory would still hold good for *ne* as distinguished in use from the other particles.

tinctly opposed to Bennett's extension of my theory. But this does not, so far as I can see, affect the validity of my conclusions regarding the force of *ne* with the subjunctive.

Bennett inadvertently misrepresents me on p. 65, unless he is still to be understood as limiting his remarks to Plautus. I did not say that verbs of mental action are *never* found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* and *caue* with the perfect subjunctive. My words ('The Latin Prohibitive,' pp. 152-153 [20-21]) were: "in the whole history of the Latin language, from the earliest times down to and including Livy, there are to be found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* with the perfect subjunctive only two, or at most three, verbs denoting *mere* mental activity." I did say that no such instances occur in Plautus, and I still believe that to be true. None of the instances cited by Bennett (p. 65) belong to the class of phenomena of which I was speaking. *Induxeris* and *feceris* are not 'verbs' of mental activity, and his other examples are not instances of *ne* or *caue*. *Animum* with *induxeris* forms, to be sure, an *expression* (though not a 'verb') of mental activity, and should have been referred to by me as a kindred phenomenon. The expression *caue flocci feceris* does not refer to the *mere* mental act of *forming a low or high estimate* (see remarks above on these passages), and *flocci facere* is therefore quite different in character from *putare*, *existimare*, *metuere*, *sperare*, etc., etc.

As the use of the perfect subjunctive with *nec* (*neque*), *nihil*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, *numquam*, etc., is not included in my theory regarding its use with *ne*, consideration of Bennett's *critique* of my interpretation of these passages is reserved for another paper.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

H. C. ELMER.

The Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic,
by KATHARINE ALLEN. (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Philology and Literature Series, vol. I, pp. 89-219.)

With this dissertation of Miss Allen's and Mr. H. R. Fairclough's suggestive monograph on the attitude of the Greek tragedians towards nature, it would seem as if the claims of the ancients in this particular sphere were in a fair way to being vindicated, and the Philistines who are prone to regard nature as a wholly modern discovery discomfited. While Miss Allen has not so rich a field as her predecessor on the Greek side, and perhaps not so skilful a hand, she has succeeded in getting together a very considerable amount of interesting and valuable material. She gives a detailed treatment of all the poets from Livius Andronicus to Varro Atacinus, with the exception of the writers of comedy. Her method is in the highest degree systematic. In the case of each poet, sky, sea, streams, mountains, etc., are treated in succession,

and under each one of these heads the artist's use of simile and metaphor, the special aspects that he represented, the epithets he used, the type of feeling and appreciation of nature that he manifested, are set forth with copious and for the most part happy illustrations. Especially striking are some of the passages quoted from the early dramatists, and students of Latin literature, to say nothing of the ever-increasing army of students of literature in English, will feel indebted to Miss Allen for drawing forth so many gems, albeit broken, from the dark unfathomed caves of the editions of *fragmenta*. Indeed, the number of good lines found among the *reliquiae* of these pioneers in Latin literature is surprisingly large, e. g. the verse cited from Ennius, p. 98:

lumine sic tremulo terra et cava caerula cudent,

or the shepherd's description of the first ship in Accius, p. 116. Lucretius, naturally enough, forms the *pièce de résistance*, and some forty pages out of a total of one hundred and twenty are devoted to him, most of the passages being quoted in illustration of his appreciation—if so mild a word can be used of the Lucretian *navia*—of the grander aspects of nature. Among the quotations from Catullus, most noticeable perhaps are the lines in the Peleus and Thetis describing the waves of the sea increasing as the morning breeze freshens, p. 192:

post vento crescente magis magis increbescunt,
purpureaque procul nantes ab luce refulgent.

From Cinna is quoted the couplet

te matutinus flentem conspexit Eous
et flentem paulo vidit post Hesperus idem.

At the end of the treatment of each poet a summary and general view of his attitude towards nature is given, and the whole concludes with a survey of the period.

Miss Allen's work shows signs of an unusually sober judgment, and her estimates of the different poets considered are for the most part sound. Perhaps the only criticism that need be made is that she is disposed to exaggerate the difference between the ancient and the modern attitude towards nature. That there is a difference, a very great difference even, no one will deny; but it is going too far to say that while the Latin poets of this period appreciated the various aspects of nature objectively, they had not, except in rare instances, sympathy with nature. The subjective view of nature so frequently found in modern poetry is, to be sure, less prominent in ancient, but it is there. It is exemplified, for example, in the couplet cited above from Cinna, and can be easily established for Catullus by reference to the thirty-first, the address to Sirmio, and the forty-sixth: iam ver egelidos refert tepores etc. Miss Allen's soberness of judgment, indeed, has the faults of its virtues, and, what is certainly unusual in a doctor's

dissertation, she is inclined to be somewhat pessimistic about her subject and to insist upon her authors' limitations. The irreverent sometimes say that searching Latin authors for examples of syntactical phenomena tends not to enthusiasm, and so perhaps a pilgrimage through the Latin poets in search of purple patches may result in some weariness of spirit.

GORDON LAING.

REPORTS.

HERMES, Vol. XXXIV.

J. Kromayer, Zur Geschichte des II. Triumvirats. VII. Dio's account of Actium is alone reliable, for Plutarch is unfair to Cleopatra. Octavian had completely blockaded Antony's fleet, and, by refusing a land battle, forced him to fight by sea. Antony's desire was to escape; so he burned part of his ships, and took with him the large sails, his best troops and all his treasures. Octavian secured the advantage by drawing him into deep water, where his own swift ships could manoeuvre, and Cleopatra, foreseeing defeat, escaped with the treasure. Neither she nor Antony was false to the fleet, but saved what they could. Rich Egypt, strengthened by Syrian and African troops, was their surest refuge.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Zum Oedipus des Sophokles. Oedipus is free from all guilt before and during the action of the play, but is the victim of an evil *δαίμων*; Kreon is an intolerable pedant and Pharisee. In 425 read *ὅσ' ἐξισώσεις*, referring to what his curses bring to his sons. Oedipus speaks the concluding verses for contrast with the proud prologue; the usual ending by the chorus is merely mechanical. The metrical irregularity of 1303 is justified by the excitement of the speaker. *αἰώρα* in 1264 is a hanging shelf for the toilet. In 1091 read *σέ γε τὸν πατριώταν*; *τροφόν* and *μητέρα* are distinct from Cithaeron; *αἶριον* is the subject of *αἰξεν*. 906 refers to a collection of oracles still existing in Sophocles' time. In 1280 read *μονούμενα*.

G. Kaibel, Longinus und die Schrift *περὶ ὕψους*. Cassius Longinus, the pupil of Ammonius Sakkas, was a critic rather than a philosopher; he was a rhetorician, and, after a fashion, a philologist. He was a pedant who lacked poetry and a sense of beauty. His style, like his criticism, is clear, simple, correct, but tiresome. No word above the ordinary level, no flush of enthusiasm, no flash of wit or humor. And yet this is the man to whom F. Marx (Wien. Stud. XX 169) has ascribed a work so full of charm and individuality, so rich in thought and so powerful in language as the treatise *περὶ ὕψους*. The double superscription shows that the authorship was a guess, and the style runs counter to the precepts of the Atticism to which Longinus did homage. This genius that disdains the trammels of style, this opulence of language, this wealth of figures and ideas, this deep penetration into the beauty of a poetic expression, this delight in possession,

in comprehension, in sympathy, would have seemed to Longinus and his like the ravings of a drunken man. The sphere of the *περὶ ὕψους* is unlike the sphere of Longinus, who is capable of admiring the jejune rhetorician, Aristeides. The complaints of the artificial style of the times remind us of Quintilian. The ascription of the decline of oratory to the loss of freedom and the materialistic tendencies of the age recalls Seneca, Petronius, Tacitus. The epigrammatic style smacks of the time when Pliny would write a whole letter for the sake of a single point. In fact, everything indicates an author of the early Empire.

W. G. Hale, *Der Codex Romanus des Catullus*. Coluccio Salutati obtained a copy of the lost Verona MS, from which about 1374 R was made, later G and O. The second class is derived mainly from R, but also from G, M being perhaps a direct copy of R. The archetype YD Ricc. 606 belongs to the BAV group.

H. Dessau criticises Arnim's chronology of Chrysostom's life. The date of Or. 43 is 105 or 106. Plin. Ep. 9. 37 was written in Aug. 107.—Th. Mommsen. The Roman loan to Salamis in 56 B. C. at first bore 4 per cent. a month, but after four years was reduced to 1 per cent. This makes 106 talents by compound interest (*perpetuae usurae*), but the creditors claimed 4 per cent. for the whole six years, which gives 200. The exclusion of freedmen from public office in the later Empire is due to Diocletian.—L. Schmidt derives Langobardi from *barda* 'axe,' and doubts the existence of confederations among the migrating Germans.—Th. Reinach. L. Corn. Lentulus L. f. was proconsul of Cilicia (*not* Macedonia) in 83–81 B. C.—L. Mitteis discusses legal details in the Oxyrhynchos papyri. In No. 34 the *Ναβαίων* is the native village registry, the *Ἀδριανή* the Roman provincial record-office. The *ἀπολογισταί* made a convenient book of extracts, the *εἰκονισταί* full copies for the archives.

B. Keil, *Zur Thessalischen Sotairosinschrift*. This should read . . . τῶν πολιτῶν οἱ πλέον]ες ἡλωρέοντος Φιλονίκω ὕιος Ἐθρώνιοι ἔδωκαν and ἀπολόμενα ἔσωσε. Ὁρέσταιο Φερεκράτ[εος λέξαντος . . . ὕιος is son of ὕιος and Ἐθρώνιοι appears in Steph. Byz. Ἐθρώνιον; only an independent state could grant *εὐεργεσία* and *ἀσυλία*. The Thessalian *ἀγορανόμος* was any magistrate who presided over the assembly. *προχειροτονία*, a custom of Ionian origin, is the decision of matters on the official docket, which came before (*πρὸ*) the rest.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Lesefrüchte*. In Parm. 3 read δαίμονες, ἢ κατὰ πάντα ταῖς. The story of Angelos in the Theocritus scholia is taken from Sophron, who sometimes treated myths and fables. About 300 A. D. Athenian rhetoricians adopted the accentual in place of the quantitative principle in composition, though Longinus opposed the movement. The fiction of Cleobulina as maker of riddles is due to Cratinus' *Κλεοβουλῖναι* and

suggested by Cleobulus' success in this field. The Minyas, which told of Orpheus' return from Hades, first introduced the figure of Charon; he was a euphemism for Death, and appeared as a fierce dog. His function as ferryman comes later.

H. Willrich, *Der Alexandersarkophag von Sidon*. This shows us the lion-hunt of Krateros, near Sidon, with the hunter at the right. The king in the murder-scene is a Cyprian. The occupant of the tomb was Kophen, son of Artabazus; his beard, dress and features prove him a Persian, and his father's intimacy with Philip permitted him to join the hunt. Being a half-breed, the linen wrapping of his body is not so strange. Issus is depicted, since there his career began; the other battles are Gaza and the campaign of Antigonos against Eumenes in 317.

A. Rehm, *Zu Eratosthenes*. The *Catasterismi* were not scholia to Aratus, but an independent work written in Alexandria, which contained both myths and star-lists, and whose terminology and arrangement by zones appears in the list of Maass. It has been much interpolated from Hipparchus, and in its account of Capricornus was influenced by Epimenides, of Sagittarius by Sositheus. It was the first work to provide all constellations with myths.

G. Busolt, *Plutarchs Nikias und Philistos*. Plutarch follows mainly Thucydides, but also uses Theopompus until the Sicilian expedition; then he draws from Philistus, whose work, though based on Thucydides, was embellished by his own reminiscences and treated from the Syracusan point of view, with some criticism of Nicias. The references to prophecy are from Timaeus.

W. Heraeus emends the scholia of Servius.—H. Willrich. Philip of Macedon was killed at the instigation of the Lyncestae, who hoped, with the aid of Persia, to regain power. Antipater's prompt measures to protect Alexander show that he feared them and knew Olympias to be innocent. The inscription of BCH. X 299 belongs to the Mithridatic period; the embassy of l. 18 was sent in March, 81 B. C., that of l. 29 was due to Murena.—C. de Boor. Vat. 96 is the archetype of all MSS of Johannes Antiochenus, and its notation of *ἐτέρα ἀρχαιολογία* against the Salmasian excerpts proves them spurious.—F. Blass comments on CXIX of the Oxyrhynchus papyri.—A. Jahn publishes an essay of Michael Psellus on Plato's Phaedrus.—G. Kaibel. In Sophr. Frag. 166 a superstitious man speaks of the magic buckthorn; fables in Sophron are not proved.

H. von Arnim, *Zum Leben Dios von Prusa*. Or. 13 shows that Dio's patron was Flavius Sabinus, for *εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ ἀρχόντων* must refer to Domitian. Sabinus was executed in 82, while Domitian's anger was fresh, and before the Chatti war of 83 the emperor had married Julia, Sabinus' wife. The reference to *delatores* in Or. 46 puts it in Vespasian's reign. The dates of

Or. 43 (101) and 48 (102) appear from allusions to the Bithynian revolt provoked by Bassus.

W. Kolbe, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Peloponnesischen Krieges*. Epigraphic lists of generals show that Kallias, Proteas, etc., belong to 432/1. As Kallias must have started about forty days (Thuc. I 60) after the Chalcidian revolt, but could not serve till Aug. 432, the revolt began about July 1. The events between this date and Sybota can not be put into the space between May and July, so the battle was fought in the previous autumn. Kolbe dates CIA. IV 179 in 432/1 and supplies many lacunae.

E. Schwartz. Tyrtaios. The second Messenian war must be dated about 500 B. C., as appears from Rhianus, Plato (Leg. 698 E) and an Olympic inscription (No. 252). The historians misunderstood Tyrtaios (Fr. 5) and followed Herodotus, whom the Spartans had deceived. Hira is the same as Abeia. Its supposed location in the Arcadian mountains is due to Epaminondas' desire to connect it with Andania, the centre of Messenian religion. The plain of Stenyclarus belonged to Sparta after 736, that of Pherae as early as 800. Aristomenes was a Helot bandit, round whom many legends gathered. Pausanias follows an obscure Messenian, who drew from Myron. The poems of Tyrtaios were written by a laconizing Athenian during the Peloponnesian war; much is borrowed from Solon and Athenian rhetoric, while we miss the Dorian pride of birth and love of sports.

C. F. W. Müller in Pl. Truc. reads 330 opperiar usque dum satis, 360 Ubi <cras> cenabis, 406 quae me caram item ut sese, 856 tonstrice matris mulcata, 862 Redhiberi vis, me alienare, 932 <si> ad, 954 quid tumes?—non succinctus ambulo, *tumes* referring to the purse hanging from his neck.—R. Kunze publishes an anonymous Greek MS from Dresden. The subject treated is astronomical, and the date 1300–1492.—F. Bechtel gives a list of new proper names in vol. III of Inscr. Gr. Insul. Mar. Aeg., and suggests that 'Απάρη is the name of a girl whose father had expected the birth of a son.—P. Wendland cites many passages from Hippolytus on Antichrist to uphold the authority of E(broicensis) R(emensis) against H(ierosolymitanus).—P. Stengel explains ἐπάρξασθαι δεπιάσσειν, 'to take a libation (from the bowl) with the cups.' The wine was not mixed for each offering, nor did the cups need to be full each time. The libation was poured when prayer was offered, but not necessarily before each meal.—B. Keil reads κορύφαις ὃν ἄγναις in Alc. 5.

R. Heinze, *Petron und der griechische Roman*. The work of Petronius blends the Menippean satire with a parody of the Greek novel. Hence the tragic scenes, the imitation of the Odyssey, the rhetorical pathos. Hence the monologues, the dialogues, the forensic debates, the versified descriptions, the frequent saws. As in the novel, the lovers, Encolpius and Giton, wander in suffering,

and their beauty, through divine intervention, attracts many unwelcome lovers. The original element in the Greek novel is neither the sophistic nor the ethnographic, but the erotic, in which form it early found an independent development.

B. Niese, *Zur Geschichte Arkadiens*. The time consumed in negotiating for the accession of Tegea and other cities and the duties claiming Epaminondas' attention put the founding of Megalopolis later than 370, while the sending of Pammenes and the silence of Xen., Plut., Diod., point to some time after the Theban invasion, probably 367. The city was not intended for a capital, but to strengthen a rural district, and did not at first include Pallantion and Asea.—The Phylarchus decree (Ditt.² 106) belongs to 255–245 B. C. The Magnesian inscription (Ditt.² 258) does not prove the renewal of the Arcadian league, for Philopoemen, the Megalopolitan, was ever a faithful servant of the Achæan confederacy.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Lesefrüchte*, criticises Jahnke's *Stattus scholia* and Radermacher's *Dionysius*, comments on Lydus *de mens.*, and defends *λοισθίαν* in Lycoph. 245. Theoc. VII 71–72 refers to places in Cos, and Ar. Rhet. 1384 b 13 to a statesman Heurippides. Rhet. ad Alex. is not by Anaximenes, and the Epist. ad Alex. was written by a different author before 300 B. C. Satyrus, the Peripatetic, lived at Philopator's court. In Ar. Lys. the women get water (328) from Kallirhoe (cf. 378); this supports Dörpfeld's topography.

E. Schwartz arranges in order the contents of Timæus' history.—S. Waszynski. The public slaves in Athens were punished as well as protected by the magistrate under whose oversight they were, but were tried in court for more serious offences. They were crowned or even freed for special services by decree of the people.—G. Sorof. Xenophon presents Proxenus and Menon (Anab. II 6) as types of νόμος and φύσις, drawing largely from Plato's Gorgias and Menon, though painting a truer picture of the latter's character, and making some use of Thucydides (III 82–83). All three authors derive their views from Antiphon, the sophist.—J. Heinemann claims that our Theognis collection consists of verses by Theognis united with a selection from different authors, Theognis included, which omits political allusions and was orally transmitted.—J. Oeri gives Ar. Plut. 1030 to the old woman as a question.—P. Stengel. Eur. Phoen. 1255 ff. shows that soothsayers observed in what direction the gall spattered, the intensity and height of the flame.—F. Boll. The star *Κηρύκειον* is a staff in the hand of Orion.—C. Robert supplies the lacunæ at the end of Euripides' Bacchæ, putting Agave's lament after v. 1300.

BARKER NEWHALL.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, LV 1, 2 (1900).

First Fascicle.

Campanisch-etruskische Urkunde (F. Buecheler). Copy of an Etruscan inscription on a large clay slab found in the necropolis of ancient Capua. The first twenty-nine lines of this important document can be made out. The rest is past restoration. Buecheler considers it probable that the inscription refers to the mortuary sphere, with which we usually associate the monuments of the dead language of the Etruscans.

Zu Platon's Philebos (Otto Apelt). 13 B: for *ἐν ἀγαθαῖς ἐνόον* read *ἐ. ἀ. ἐννοῶν* rather than *ἐνορῶν* (Thompson). 15 A: for *ἡ πολλή σπουδή* read *πολλή που ᾗδη*. 18 AB: for *κατανοεῖν* read *κατὰ νοῦν*. 23 D: for *ἱκανῶς* read *καὶ ἄνους*. 28 E: for *οὐδὲν τῶν αὐτῶν, οὐ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων*. 30 D: *γενοῦστος* is a joke after the order of Kratylos, and is not to be disturbed. Exegesis of 33 E, 34 B, 56 A. 56 A: for *ξύμπασα αὐτῆς αὐλητική* read *ξ. ἄνευ τῆς αὐλητικῆς*. 57 B: for *προβεβληκέναι σκοπῶν* read *σκοπόν*. Exegesis of 62 AB. 62 D: for *αὐτὰς μὲν γινῆναι* read *αὐτὰ μ.*

Untersuchungen zu Ciceros Timaeus (Carl Fries). The prooemium was written after the *Academica*, consequently after 709—say 710. But that does not date the translation, because Cicero had a *corpus prooemiorum* on which he drew when he desired to inaugurate a new work, and Tiro may have clapped this prooemium on the translation. From the examination of the language Fries reaches the conclusion that the *Timaeus* was translated before Cicero wrote the *De Natura Deorum*, so that it belongs to the time of the *Tusculan Questions*, and Cicero himself joined prooemium and translation together. As to the object of the translation, K. F. Hermann's view that the Platonic *Timaeus* was to be the basis of a dialogue, in which the Pythagorean Nigidius Figulus was cast for a leading part, must be accepted, in spite of some difficulties. The article closes with readings from *Codex Parisinus 6624*, an exhibition of the dependence of Marsilius Ficinus on Cicero's translation, a rejection of evidence from the Ciceronian rendering of the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon, on the ground that it has been tampered with by Columella, and an attempt to fill a gap in *Tim.*, c. 9.

Der Schluss des aeolischen Epos vom Zorne des Achill (W. Helbig). It is commonly assumed that the old Aeolic epic of the Wrath of Achilles ended with the death of Hektor. But the first part of XXIII, on the burial of Patroklos, down to v. 257 can not be separated from XXII, which recounts the death of Hektor; and it is especially significant that in both books the purpose of Achilles to abandon the corpse of Hektor to the dogs, or to the dogs and birds of prey, plays so conspicuous a part. This purpose, however, was not executed, and Helbig suggests that the passage was struck out by the later redactor, in spite of the

announcement in the first lines of the Iliad: αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι, verses which, according to Helbig, belong not to our Iliad, but to the Aeolic epic of the Wrath of Achilles. The version according to which Priam ransomed the dead body of his son is due to the milder Ionic spirit which did not sympathize with the wild vengeance of the Aeolic poet, who was capable of making Achilles reject the prayer of Priam and set the dogs on the corpse of Hektor before the eyes of the aged father. The verses (XXIII 184-91) in which the dogs are kept off by Aphrodite and the body anointed with oil while Apollo shaded the corpse from the sun by a dark cloud, are a very late fabrication and mark the *non plus ultra* of the thoughtless way in which later epic poetry made the deities take part in the action. The effect here, according to Helbig, is wellnigh comic.

Neue Fluchtafeln (R. Wünsch). Wünsch gives a revision of the new imprecatory tablets recently published by Ziebarth.

Die Idee der ersten Eclogue Vergils (M. Schanz). An analysis of the first Eclogue shows that the object is to thank Octavianus, the god in Rome, for protecting the poet's property in the distribution of land. Tityrus is the poet, but the details do not fit Vergil—the position of a freedman, the advanced age. It is an old difficulty. According to Schanz, the freedom which Tityrus gained at Rome symbolizes the liberation of the Roman people effected by Augustus, who was actually designated as Ζεὺς ἐλευθέριος after the battle of Actium. Tityrus is at once a representative of Vergil and a representative of the Roman people.

Vermischtes zu den griechischen Lyrikern und aus Papyri (F. Blass). Antistrophic responsion is often strengthened not only by recurrent words, but also by echoing sounds, and Blass undertakes to show the value of this feature of lyric poetry for textual criticism. A tautomeric responsion is not to be disturbed, and is sometimes to be replaced. The other half of the paper is taken up with notes on the Grenfell and Hunt papyri.

Der Inhalt des Georgos von Menander (K. Dziatzko). In continuation of his article in the previous volume, Dziatzko takes up the Epidicus of Plautus as throwing light on the plot of the Georgos and as showing, at the same time, the great independence of Plautus in manipulating his Greek originals as well as the respect which he had for the views and customs of his public in important points. The marriage of children of the same father and different mothers would not have shocked the Greek. In the Epidicus, Stratippocles is shunted off.

Zur aristotelischen κάθαρσις (G. Lehnert). Bernays' medical interpretation of the Aristotelian κάθαρσις receives additional support from a closer study of the old commentators and scholiasts, and Lehnert passes a number of passages in review as the best preparation for the exegesis of the famous 'purging.' He then

proceeds to dwell on the delights of a 'good cry,' not unknown to the ancients, and winds up with a passage which Szanto has expiscated from Goethe's *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*, II 5: "Hier nun konnte die edle Dichtkunst abermals ihre heilende Kräfte erweisen. Innig verschmolzen mit Musik heilt sie alle Seelenleiden aus dem Grunde, indem sie solche gewaltig anregt, hervorruft und in auflösenden Schmerzen verflüchtigt."

Porcius Licinus über den Anfang der römischen Kunstdichtung (R. Büttner). Büttner upholds the old view that in the well-known verses of Porcius Licinus (Gell. XVII 21, 42): *Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu | Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram*, the reference is to Ennius, and not to Livius Andronicus, as Leo and Schanz have maintained. Ennius was the Roman Homer, the *alter Homerus* of Lucilius, just as Chaucer was the 'Father of English Poetry'—not absolutely the first in order of time, but first in order of time and merit.

Der Pindarcommentator Chrysippos (A. Körte). The Chrysippos cited in the Pindaric scholia is not the famous Stoic philosopher, but is possibly identical with a freedman of Cicero's, to whom reference is made as a man of some culture. Said Chrysippos was a sorry creature of very moderate attainments and little common-sense, and Chrysippean notes on Pindar harmonize with this description.

Zur Epitome des Adamantios (R. Foerster). Additions and emendations from a Paris MS to the *Φυσιολογικὰ* of Adamantios, itself an abstract of the lost work of Polemon.

Miscellen.—L. Radernacher submits a number of emendations of Greek authors. Of especial interest is the list of examples by which he supports his recent contention that *διά* in compounds has often been added after *καί*, e. g. X. An. V 3, 4, *καὶ διέλαβον* for *καὶ ἔλαβον*.—J. M. Stahl discusses Soph. El. 221–9.—Hugo Rabe gives specimens of a prolix commentary on Hermogenes *περὶ στάσεων* which is as poor as it is prolix.—Breysig elucidates and emends the curious anonymous poem on the alphabet published by Omont in 1881, by the help of a commentary of the same date.—J. M. Stahl retracts what he said about the silence of the German grammars of Greek as to the abstract translations of the predicative participle (A. J. P. XIX 463), and cites Krüger, §56, 10, 2, *à propos* of his explanation of Thuk. IV 63, 1: *διὰ τὸ ἤδη φοβεροῦς παρόντας Ἀθηναίους*, where he divorces *διὰ τὸ ἤδη* from *φ. π.* 'A.

Second Fascicle.

Griechische Titel im Ptolemäerreich (Max L. Strack). A list of the titles conferred by the Ptolemies, with a discussion of a subject that is always near to the German heart, even in this democratic age.

Die Widmungselegie des letzten Buches des Propertius (A. Dieterich). A minute analysis of the poem, showing how admirably the two elements of the book are incorporated in the introductory elegy—the antiquarian, as Dieterich calls it, and the erotic.

Zum zweiten Mimiamb des Herodas (O. Hense). Rudolf Herzog, in his *Koische Forschungen u. Funde* (A. J. P. XX 459), claims for the speech of the *Πορνοβοσκός* a certain *ὑπερείδειος χαρακτήρ*. With this view Hense is not quite in accord. True, the discourse of Battaros has a number of points of contact with the *τόποι* of Attic orators, Hypereides among them. True, Hypereides was not a scrupulous gentleman, and six of his speeches were held in defence of improper persons. But the tone of his discourse was that of high society, and Battaros is vulgarity itself. According to Hense, this mimiambus is not a travesty of Attic judicial eloquence, but a comic contrast to the elaborate apparatus and elevated tone of forensic oratory.

Neue Fluchtafeln (R. Wünsch). A continuation of the curious subject treated in the preceding fascicle.

Ein Prolog des Diphilos und eine Komödie des Plautus (F. Skutsch). FIDES speaks the prologue of the *Casina* of Plautus, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ, the prologue of the *κληρούμενοι* of Diphilos; but what this figure had to do with the contents of the piece does not appear. Possibly the changes made by Plautus in the last part of his adaptation of the *κληρούμενοι* may have effaced the rôle. Leo thinks that the close of the *Casina* can not have been that of the *κληρούμενοι*, but Skutsch does not admit the cogency of his reasons, and adduces a story from Ovid, *Fast.* II 331 foll., in which Omphale and Hercules exchange raiment, and Faunus, who wishes to take advantage of Omphale, falls afoul of Hercules. It is a doublet to the scene in *Casina*, 875 foll., and may go back to the same Greek original.

Beiläufige Bemerkungen (H. Usener). I. In the first of these casual remarks Usener notices the recurrence of eclipses at the deaths of the heroes of universal history. As there was darkness over the whole land when Our Saviour died, so was there at the death of Caesar, and at the death of Nero. Even philosophers such as Karneades and Proklos share the distinction, and the *Iliad* tells of the darkness that Zeus shed on the battlefield when Sarpedon, when Patroklos fell. II. Sappho's Farewell to Virginité is paralleled by the hymeneal songs and observances of the Slavonic peoples. III. The metrical structure of the Sapphic hendekasyllabon in the Ode of Melinno on Rome follows Horatian law in thirteen out of fifteen cases. The other two Usener emends. IV. Inscriptions give indications of the decline of the worship of the old gods of Greece as early as the first century before Christ, even in retired Arcadia. V. The intercessory work

of the saints is a survival of the intercessory work of the gods. VI. Influence of the Stoic philosophy on the doctrine of the Christian heresy of the Monarchists, Noetos and his sect. VII. Eur. Andr. 848 read ἐκ πίερας. The Leukadian rock is meant. VIII. An inscription on the inside of a well-curb: ὕε, κύε (Hippol. Haer. 5, 7) ὑπέρχυε, means 'Rain (Zeus), Conceive (Earth), Overflow (Well).' IX. On the use of *enim* in the Excerpta Valeria.

Zu den Fragmenten des Euripides (K. Busche). Various conjectures.

Miscellen.—Zu Alkaios (F. Solmsen). De Stobaei loco (U).—Nachträge zu Plautus (C. F. W. Müller).—Zu dem Phoenix des Lactantius (A. Niese).—Brutes (A. v. Domaszewski).—Die Inschriften des Constantius Gallus (O. Seeck).

B. L. G.

BEITRÄGE ZUR ASSYRIOLOGIE UND SEMITISCHEN SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT, herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH und PAUL HAUPT. Vierter Band, Heft 2 (pp. 155-278). Leipzig, 1900.¹

The second Heft of the fourth volume of the Beiträge contains six articles.

The first of these (pp. 155-67) is a collection of textual notes by F. H. Weissbach on the Series *Maqlû*, parts of which have been already published by K. Tallqvist (Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae, XX, Nr. 6). When Tallqvist undertook to edit the tablets of this series, only two volumes of Bezold's Catalogue of the K-Collection had appeared. In the third and fourth volumes of Bezold's work, further examples of the series were mentioned as having been discovered. Weissbach, in his notes in the Beiträge, presents the results of his studies of the same series at the British Museum in 1899. He rightly remarks that the registration of even the most insignificant text-variant, as well as of every new word and line, must be of the greatest importance for the recognition of new duplicates or of allied fragments, and may sometimes even aid in their discovery. He then proceeds to tabulate the results of his investigation of Tablets II-VII. Of these, the fullest text which he has been able to obtain is undoubtedly Nr. VII, lines 34-49, which he restores almost completely. I will call attention merely to the occurrence of the name *Nin-a-xa-kud-du*, who is called elsewhere 'the lady of the shining waters' (see Hommel, Semiten, I, p. 383, and cf. Prince, JAOS. XXI, on the unilingual Sumerian inscription in ASKT., p. 105, 32, where this goddess is co-ordinated with Marduk). Weissbach publishes, on pp. 163 ff., the autographed text of the *Maqlû*

¹ For the report on Bd. IV, Heft 1, see A. J. P. XX, pp. 104-7.

tablet Nr. VII. While he admits the practical impossibility of a complete restoration of the *Maglû* series in the near future, he adds (p. 167): "When we consider how many fragments of the series were recognized at the same time by Bezold when only a few of them had been published, we may regard it as certain that now, when at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the entire series have been identified, a new classification of the Aššurbanipal library could be made with excellent success."

Weissbach's second article on 'Susian Clay Tablets' (pp. 167-74), with fourteen autographed texts (pp. 175-201), is an important contribution to the study of Elamitic literature. In 1899, Weissbach and F. Bork collated with great care a number of Susian texts, most of which had already been published by Pinches and Sayce (see pp. 168-9). Our author, while modestly admitting the imperfections of his new copies, due, as he explains, to the illegible character of the original, which frequently confuses signs of quite different values, insists, and with some reason, that he has improved upon his predecessors' work. The tablets here published, which are all in cuneiform characters in the Elamitic language, came from Kuyunjik-Nineveh and have been in the earth since 608 B. C., i. e. they must have been prepared at least one hundred years earlier than the date of the inscription of Bisutûn. On p. 201 Weissbach gives a list of sixty-five simple sign-values and of seventeen compound syllabic signs which he regards as certain. Bezold conjectures that these texts are all contracts, but our author, judging as much from the form as from the probable contents, is more inclined to regard them as letters. He wisely makes no attempt to translate them, no doubt considering Sayce's efforts in this direction as sufficient warning (see p. 171, note). As to the reason of these documents being found at Nineveh, he thinks that they are specimens of a correspondence between the Assyrian and Elamitic kings. It is to be hoped that a close study of these and other Susian texts will give us a more satisfactory knowledge of them.

Eugen Mittwoch, in a brief paper on Hebrew inscriptions from Palmyra which is accompanied by one photographic reproduction (pp. 203-6), discusses the textual peculiarities of an inscription in the Hebrew square characters written on a stone gate. The lines, of which a "squeeze" and photograph had already been taken by Euting and published by Landauer,¹ consist of extracts from Deuteronomy, e. g. on the lintel, from Deut. vi. 4-9, and on the left post, from Deut. vii. 15. Mittwoch identifies the fragmentary inscription on the right post with Deut. vii. 14 and xxviii. 5. As Landauer and Berger have shown, these inscriptions probably date from the third century A. D. Euting, Landauer and Berger think that the gate is part of the remains of an ancient synagogue,

¹ Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. Pr. Akad. d. Wiss., 1884, pp. 933 ff.

but Mittwoch regards it as the door of a private house. He points out that inscriptions of this sort, containing Biblical verses, may very well have been written upon private dwellings, just as we find extracts from the Koran inscribed on modern Oriental houses.

In the fourth article of the Hefst (pp. 207-19), Moritz Sobernheim presents copies and translations of some hitherto unknown Palmyrene inscriptions which he obtained in 1899 while on a journey to Palmyra. They are all from Palmyra, except two grave-busts from Qaryetên. Of the Palmyrene inscriptions, the most interesting is Nr. 7, which was found on the side-wall of an entrance-corridor (pp. 211-14). The text stands beneath a pictorial representation, of which the author gives a fair reproduction. The context plainly shows that the inscription and picture both belonged originally to a temple dedicated to the god 'Azizû. The stone was probably merely used as building material in its present place in the gate. It is interesting to note that this is the first recorded mention of the god 'Azizû in the Aramaic inscriptions, although he is alluded to Wad. 2134, CIG. 4619 as 'Aṣaṣo. Julian, on the authority of Jamblichas, identifies him with Ares. There can be little doubt, as Sobernheim shows, that 'Azizû was connected with the sun-cult. The name is a common one for persons in both the Palmyrene and Greek inscriptions. The rest of the article is devoted to the inscriptions on an extensive grave-vault, of which a full plan is given (p. 215).

R. Zehnpfund contributes as the fifth article (pp. 220-26) a paper on the nature of the *zuqagîpu*, which he shows to have been the ancient Babylonian instrument used for surgical scarification. On a unilingual Sumerian seal-cylinder, of which Zehnpfund gives an excellent reproduction, it appears as a double scourge, the handle of which was made of bronze, and the lashes of woven leather strips were provided with hooks at the ends. At the top of the handle are two balls, clearly intended to represent cups, into which the blood drawn by the scourge was collected. This operation was based on the principles of ancient phlebotomy, which taught that many diseases were due to a plethora of blood. According to von Oefele, cow-horns, calabashes, etc., were used for the same purpose. The same instrument is mentioned in the O.T. as 'agrâbh, A.V. 'scorpion' (1 K. xii; cf. 2 Chr. x), and was evidently intended to be used in punishment. Its exact nature was not known until this representation was discovered in the ancient Babylonian literature. Its purpose is also plainly discernible from the same seal, on which a Babylonian surgeon (*âšû*) calls himself 'the superintendent of the divine scarifying scorpion' (*sukkallu ilu zuqagîpu*). It was therefore primarily a surgical instrument, and was also used in a cult, as may be seen from the prefixed *ilu*. Zehnpfund's paper is a highly important contribution toward the study of ancient Babylonian medical methods.

The last article in the *Beiträge*, by Thomas Friedrich (pp. 227-78), is an interesting account, with illustrations, of the recent German excavations at Senjirli,¹ with special reference to the *ekal Xatti* and the *bit xillāni* (pp. 243-78). Friedrich shows (p. 247) that the word *ekal* in building-inscriptions indicates, not only the entire palace, but also any single room. This explains the frequent statements that *ekallāte*, e. g. *certain rooms*, are made of ivory, or of various valuable woods. The combination of clay and wood in the adornment of a room was called *nipišti Xatti*, both in Assyria (p. 244) and in Babylonia (p. 247). H. Barth (ZA. III, p. 93) sees a cognate to Assyrian *xillāni* in Heb. *h'lon*. The probability is, however, that *xillāni* means not merely 'window,' but any opening in the wall.² Friedrich thinks that *bit xillāni* and other similar expressions denote a covered hall or corridor constructed in Hittite style, connecting two apartments or parts of a building.

There can be no doubt that the discoveries of the Germans in Southern Babylonia are of the highest value for our knowledge of ancient Babylonian architecture.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

¹ Mitth. aus d. Or. Sammlungen d. kgl. Museen z. Berlin, XII 2, 1898.

² Ball in PSBA. IX, 1887, p. 67.

BRIEF MENTION.

The first volume of the Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας contains the first part of the Catalogue of the Epigraphical Museum, the second, by KAVVADIAS, a treatise of especial interest, which bears the title: τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ καὶ ἡ θεραπεία τῶν ἀσθενῶν. The introduction deals with Asklepios, the origin and spread of his cult, its rise in Thessaly and its introduction into Epidauros, which became, as it were, the archiepiscopal see of Aesculapian worship and was looked upon even by the faithful in Kos as the mother shrine. In the next chapter we are told how all the territory of Epidauros was sacred to Asklepios, and we follow the fortunes of the sanctuary in antiquity. The Roman Empire only enhanced the reputation of this great health-resort; and to form an image of Epidauros, M. KAVVADIAS bids us make a manner of composite photograph out of Our Lady of Lourdes, the waters of Marienbad, and the Kneipp cure. Even the decrees issued from Christian Constantinople were not at once fatal. But while the double wall about the τέμενος may have sufficed to check the incursions of the Goths in 395, nothing could withstand the determined onslaught of Theodosios the Second, and from him dates the final extinction of the worship of Asklepios (426). The temple and the tholos of Polykleitos remained long intact, but the fearful earthquakes of 522 and 551 shattered temple and tholos and theatre, and then the night of the Middle Ages settled upon the scene. Hereupon follows a list of visitors—Desmonceaux (1669), Chandler (1762), Dodwell (1805), 'Classic Gell' (1810), Leake (1830), Blouet, Pouqueville, and Curtius, with an account of the excavations conducted by M. KAVVADIAS as ephoros from 1881 to 1887 and from 1891 to 1898. The excavations of the first period are recorded in the first volume of the *Fouilles d'Épidaure*. The accounts of the later work are scattered through various reports and journals, so that M. KAVVADIAS has done a service for which all will be grateful in bringing the whole subject within the compass of a single volume of moderate size and popular style. Epidauros is one of the first points reached in Dörpfeld's Peloponnesian tour, and stands out with the freshness of a virgin experience in the mind of every one who has been privileged to follow the guidance of that unrivalled interpreter of the architectural past of Greece. To hear the words of the three great tragic poets borne up from the orchestra of the theatre at Epidauros gives a thrill never to be forgotten, no matter what theory of Greek pronunciation is

followed. The whole book is full of memories as well as of instruction, and I leave it with regret. The student of epigraphy will be glad to have the photograph of the Paian of Isyllos, and he whose head has not been permanently turned by the first glass of masticha taken on the dusty road from the Piraeus to Athens will be interested to find that M. KAVVADIAS has thought it best to translate into the modern idiom, τῶν πολλῶν χάριν, the famous passage of the Plutus which describes Karion's adventures in the temple of Asklepios. Evidently M. KAVVADIAS does not believe in any of the familiar formulae as to the relation of the ancient to the modern tongue.

Frederic Harrison's words: 'Horace remains to this day the type of the untranslatable,' form one of the mottoes of IMELMANN'S *Donec gratus eram tibi. Nachdichtungen und Nachklänge aus drei Jahrhunderten* (Berlin, Weidmann). But this discouraging sentence is balanced by one of Herder's: 'Vielleicht hat sich kein Dichter lieblicher und öfter als Er metempsychosieret.' Now, metempsychosis, according to Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (A. J. P. XIII 517), is the highest achievement in translation, so that Herder welcomes success where Frederic Harrison pronounces failure. IMELMANN'S specimens, which nearly all bear well-known names, begin with Weckherlin (1584-1653) and end with Theodore Martin (1878). The only other English version is by the elder Lord Lytton, and the compiler has been rather unfortunate in his choice of Martin's mate. It is nearly thirty years since I undertook to show, at unnecessary length, Lord Lytton's eminent unfitness for the task. 'Horace,' I said in the *New Eclectic Magazine*, April, 1870, 'is the despair of translators. His Muse, like his own Lyde, has her hair gathered into a tidy knot after the Laconic fashion. His English copies are either bald or buried under a horse-hair wig'—and Lord Lytton's copy seemed to me exceptionally bad. 'The tightly twisted toils, through which only a Marsian boar could burst, are unravelled out into a thin gauze which irritates without detaining.' The verse is 'rugged and inharmonious,' 'an Indian jungle of cretics, antispasts, molossi and proceleusmatics.' 'The rendering is needlessly verbose and abounds in Bulwerian capitals.' Adjectives are multiplied in defiance of Horace's well-known parsimony. The false picturesque is coupled with the tamest commonplace, and so on through the whole register of leaden coins which the critic of that day nailed remorselessly to the counter. I am not certain that all the details of that criticism are just, and the tone is very different from the mildness of the *Brief Mention* of to-day; but I am very sure that Professor Shorey's notes on Horace, Carm. III 9, would have helped IMELMANN to a better English metempsychosis. But IMELMANN'S slip in one of his

English selections is pardonable, and the notes which accompany his specimens will be read with interest by students of German literature.

An editor of Pindar may well be expected to heed the proverb: *μη κίνει Καμάρινον*, and even if I had not known the proverb, I should have profited by the experience which brought upon my head a weighty reply of nearly twenty pages to a modest and, as I had fancied, an irrefragable criticism. (Comp. A. J. P. VIII 228 with IX 158-77.) Since that time the subject of the Sequence of Tenses in Latin has been sacrosanct to me. Not that I have changed my views in the least. It was no new doctrine to me that the subjunctive tenses in Latin have a time of their own, but I considered it equally unquestionable that under the pressure of the established machinery of the compound sentence the differences that are plain enough in the simple sentence are sometimes crushed out, just as nature is, only too often, crushed out by society. What havoc is made, for instance, by *oratio obliqua*! There is but one infinitive to represent all the three past tenses; there is no way of rendering the difference between the long imperative and the short imperative; there is practically only one form for the unreal conditional sentence. And as a matter of practice, it still seems to me that the much-abused rules for the sequence of tenses are much more easily learned than the psychological refinements that have been proposed as substitutes for them. But I have already said all that I desire to say on the subject, and my present office is merely to register the results arrived at by a pupil and admirer of Professor HALE. In his *Sequence of Tenses based on Caesar's Gallic War*, Professor ARTHUR TAPPAN WALKER reaches the following conclusion: 'I believe that in Caesar every tense of the subjunctive and indicative alike has its own meaning and is never wrested from that meaning by a rule of sequence. But I believe also that Caesar had a feeling of sequence that led him to avoid irregular uses of the subjunctive and gave him a tendency to use an equivalent indicative construction, if possible, or otherwise to recast the sentence.' So, for instance, according to Professor WALKER, Caesar deliberately dodges the use of the perfect subjunctive representing the imperfect indicative of the question—ay, dodges it, *tamquam scopulum*, to use the language of the illustrious author of the treatise *de Analogia*. Possibly some one will arise and say that Caesar's regularity was intended simply to spite Professor HALE; and if I had not renounced all discussion of the subject, I might venture to remark that Professor WALKER's articles of faith, like some others, are hard to reconcile. How, for instance, the imperfect subjunctive can be said to have its own meaning when it is used 'with an aoristic force' or 'with the force of an aoristic pluperfect,' I fail to see.

The initial volumes of the Oxford *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca* are externally attractive, as was to be expected of the Clarendon Press. The type is clear, the paper good, the limp cloth binding exceptionally strong, the price very reasonable. The list of editors includes many of the leading names in the classical world of Great Britain and Ireland, and in most cases special fitness will be recognized. Aeschylus has fallen to SIDGWICK; Apollonius to SEATON, who has worked in his author for years; Catullus and ROBINSON ELLIS infallibly suggest each the other. Every one will recognize the property that REID, WILKINS and PURSER have in Cicero, that BUTCHER has in Demosthenes; MONRO has made Homer his dwelling-place for more than a score of years, LINDSAY is a Plautine scholar of high rank, TYRRELL has a right to Terence, POSTGATE has done noteworthy work in the Latin elegiacs. But to specify further would be invidious. The specimen numbers comprise the first four books of *Thucydides*, by H. STUART JONES, of Trinity College, Oxford; the first two tetralogies of *Plato*, by J. BURNET, of St. Andrews; *Lucretius*, by CYRIL BAILEY, of Exeter College; and the minor works of *Tacitus*, by the well-known translator and editor of Tacitus, H. FURNEAUX. As there is no English text, the price can be kept down in the American market, and, under the editorial supervision of such scholars as have been named, the series can not fail to find wide acceptance in this country as well as in England.

Years before Shilleto wrote his Appendix B to his edition of *De Falsa Legatione*, in which he ascribed the negative in $\delta\sigma\tau' \acute{o}\nu$ with inf. to the influence of *oratio obliqua*, Poppo—it was in 1835—had hit upon the same explanation in his commentary on Thuk. V 40, though he failed to carry out the principle. Madvig soon made the observation common property, and some space was given to the subject in this Journal, VII 174, not because of the novelty of the thesis, but because of a strange mistake made in the earlier editions of that authoritative manual, Professor Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*. See A. J. P. VI 523. In the article of the Journal referred to, I have considered a number of the passages that have given the commentators trouble, and on one of these Dr. SANDYS has bestowed a relatively long note in the volume with which he has recently enriched his Demosthenic series: *Demosthenes On the Peace, Second Philippic, On the Chersonesus, Third Philippic* (Macmillan). This new work has been done in Dr. SANDYS' usual excellent style, and to characterize it I should have to repeat what I have often said of the accomplished Public Orator in the University of Cambridge, who has made himself a special place among the students of Attic oratory. The passage which many commentators have passed over dryshod is found in the Third Philippic (IX 48), and, to save the reader the trouble of turning to the text, I quote it entire: $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omega \Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma,$

τέτταρας μῆνας ἢ πέντε, τὴν ὥραίαν αὐτὴν, ἐμβαλόντας ἂν καὶ κακώσαντας τὴν χώραν ὀπλίταις καὶ πολιτικοῖς στρατεύμασιν ἀναχωρεῖν ἐπ' οἴκου πάλιν, οὕτω δ' ἀρχαίως εἶχον μᾶλλον δὲ πολιτικῶς ὥστε οὐδὲ χρημάτων ὠνεῖσθαι παρ' οὐδενὸς ἀλλ' εἶναι νόμιμόν τινα καὶ προφανῆ τὸν πόλεμον. Nothing seems clearer to me than the domination of ἀκούω. Such is the suggestion of Shilleto, such the doctrine of Seume. But Dr. SANDYS rebels on the ground of the remoteness of ἀκούω. And yet there is no difficulty in the shift from the infinitive ἀναχωρεῖν to the indicative οὕτω δ' ἀρχαίως εἶχον, nor is there anything surprising in the omission of ὅτι. The use of ὅτι would have involved reflexion, and reflexion would have checked the vault from the infinitive to the indicative. ἀρχαίως ἔχειν would not have been so clear as the imperfect indicative, and the falling out of the line of the construction is quite in keeping with the swing of the passage. The other two exceptions cited by Dr. SANDYS—Lykurg. 53 and Dem. LIII 1—are both discussed in the article mentioned, and I repeat here my explanation of the second passage for the sake of a parallel which has since suggested itself. 'In Dem. LIII 1: οὐδ' αὖ οὕτως ἀπορος ἦν οὐδ' ἀφίλος ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν ἐξευρεῖν τὸν ἀπογράψοντα, the imperf. ἦν,' I said, 'might fairly be held to be the imperfect of impression (*I seemed to myself*), and so in the antithesis we have ἡγησάμενος.' In like manner, Antiphon, II β, 9: ἥδη ἐκαστησόμενος is balanced by ἀπεσπερούμην. It is nothing but the old formula, Imperf. Ind. = ἐμελλον + Fut. Inf.

When one turns from the adequate editions such as Dr. SANDYS has given us to the run of manufactures that call themselves commentaries, one is tempted to unphilosophical impatience. With all charity for divergent ideals of the editor's work, there are certain essentials that go to make up any decent performance in the editorial line. The editor may prefer to limit the range of illustrative quotation to the author himself or to congeneric literature, and yet not fall short of his duty. He may despatch matters grammatical with a word or two and escape reproach. He may decline to wander off into historical excursions and may content himself with a curt explanation of allusions and the barest summaries of situations. The use of plastic and ceramic art by way of illustration is to a large extent a matter of sphere and judgment. But every side of an author is to be illuminated, and no real difficulty is to be shirked. How capricious many commentators are, is a fact that needs no emphasis. Some write to meet the demands of commerce, some to air their own notions, and, as a natural consequence, there has been gathering for some years a rebellion against commentaries, the signs of which have been noted in this Journal. We are becoming familiar with the aspect of texts devoid of apparatus beyond a general introduction and an historical and geographical register. Then there are other editions intended to smooth the way of the reader as much

as possible. They do not go so far as to furnish interlinear translations, but there is ever a prompter at the reader's side, and not even the most gentle exercise of the intellect is permitted. The stores of more ambitious predecessors are laid under contribution and their notes appropriated so far as they are useful to the mild meddlers with classical literature. To these are added renderings of the most familiar idioms and turns of expression. There is an analysis, often borrowed, a few cheap illustrations, a metrical scheme, if the text is poetical, an appendix of variants to show that the editor is a critical scholar as well as a friend in need. Such is the character of the *Euripides auf Tauris*, edited by Dr. SIEGFRIED REITER, which forms the sixth volume of the Freytag *Sammlung griechischer u. römischer Klassiker, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*. That such editions will breed scholars I do not believe, and it is a sad omen that towards the close of the text two of the verses, 1362-3, have been thrown into *pi* that reminds one of a disorderly linotype. But that the scheme is calculated to meet a demand there can, unfortunately, be no question.

E. W. F.: At the sight of a new book of etymologies such as E. LIDÉN'S *Studien zur altindischen und vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz), one is tempted to ask *cui bono*? The good to the author is very sure—the absorbing interest of solving, after finding, the problem. But there is a practical good. Take an etymology like the comparison of post-Vedic *vāgurā* 'net, snare, yarn' with Lat. *vēlum* 'sail' (p. 21). There is no profit in knowing this as an isolated fact. It is not, past all doubt, certainly true, as *vellus* 'fleece' offers a possible *rapprochement* for *vēlum* nearer home; but, supposing it to be true that *vēlum* meant 'yarn,' then Plautus's *verborum velitatio* means etymologically 'word-wrangle.' This lets us explain *vēles* 'skirmisher' as a transformation of *vēlox* 'swift' under the influence of *comes*, *miles*, *eques*, *pedes*. A danger of morphological studies may here be mentioned, *à propos* of the name *zebrule*, just given to a cross between the zebra and Shetland pony—clearly assimilated to the word *mule*. Dialectically we know in America the slang-formation *animule*. Will the etymologists of the future abstract a suffix and write *m-ule*, perhaps? He will perhaps even speak of the verb-suffix (nasal affix, infix?) *-m*, if he should have to explain the *youn*, *weem*, *theym* of the Cape Cod dialect, obviously infections from *I'm*; and if the locution *I'm is*, which I have heard from babies learning to talk and from a few negroes, should have to be explained, one wonders how it will be treated by the linguistics of 3000 A. D.! Is it a depressing reflection to note that the advance of new, and better, etymologies lies over the remains of old, and good, etymologies, here interred, for the most part, in footnotes? No; for that is part of our counsel of perfection.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Bosworth (E. W.) Hand-book of Latin Notes. Richmond, Va., *Whittet & Shepperson*, 1899. c. 121 pp. 8vo, cl., 75 cts.

Cynewulf. The Christ of Cynewulf; with introd., notes and glossary, by A. S. Cook. Boston, *Ginn*, 1900. c. 97 + 294 pp. 8vo, cl., \$1.65.

Demosthenes. On the Peace: Second Philippic; On the Chersonesus; and Third Philippic; introd., and critical and explanatory notes, by J. Edwin Sandys. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 72 + 260 pp. 16mo, cl., net \$1.10.

Gudeman (Alfred), Ed. Latin Literature of the Empire; selected and ed., with rev. texts and introds. New York, *Harper*, 1900. c. 2 v. 12mo, cl., ea. \$1.80.

Homer. Four Books of the Iliad, 1, 6, 22, 24; tr. by W. C. Bryant, with introd. and notes. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.* [1899]. c. 9 + 119 pp. 16mo, pap., net 15 cts.

— Iliad; ed., with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes and appendices, by Walter Leaf. V. 1, bks. 1-12. 2d ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 36 + 600 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$4.

Ovid. First and Second Books of Ovid's Metamorphoses, with Ovid's Autobiography; ed., for the use of schools, by W. T. Peck. Boston, *Ginn*, 1900. c. 12 + 234 pp. 16mo, cl., 55 cts.

Saurusaitis (P.) An Abridged Dictionary of the English-Lithuanian Languages. Waterbury, Ct., *P. Saurusaitis*, 1899. c. 12 + 188 pp. 16mo, pap., 50 cts.

Sweet (H.) Practical Study of Languages: a guide for learners; with tables and illustrative quotations. New York, *H. Holt & Co.*, 1900. 15 + 280 pp. 12mo, cl., net \$1.50.

Taylor (R. L.) Alliteration in Italian. (Yale Diss.) New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1900. 15 + 151 pp. 8vo, pap., net 75 cts.

ENGLISH.

Anthologia Nova Oxoniensis. Transl. into Greek and Latin verse. Edited by R. Ellis and A. D. Godley. London, 1899. 8vo, 290 pp. 6s.

Bleek (W. H. J.) Vocabularies of the Districts of Lourenzo Marques, etc. London, 1899. 4to. 4s.

Hime (H. W. L.) Lucian the Syrian Satirist. London, 1900. 8vo. 5s.

Holmes (T. R.) Caesar's Conquest of Gaul. London, 1899. 8vo, 892 pp. 21s.

King (L. W.) *Babylonian Religion and Mythology*. London, 1899. 8vo, 232 pp. With 12 illustr. 3s. 6d.

Leland (C. G.) *The Unpublished Legends of Virgil*. London, 1899. 8vo, 228 pp. 6s.

Mau (A.) *Pompeii, its Life and Art*. Trans. by Fr. W. Kelsey. London, 1899. 8vo, 532 pp. £1 5s.

Poets, Greek Comic. *Select Fragments*. Edited by A. W. Pickard Cambridge. London, 1899. 8vo. 5s.

Sayce (A. H.) *Babylonians and Assyrians: Life and Customs*. Edinburgh, 1900. 8vo, x + 273 pp. 5s.

Skeat (W. W.) *Malay Magic: Introduction to Folk-lore and Popular Religion of Malay Peninsula*. London, 1900. 8vo, 702 pp. 21s.

FRENCH.

Cartault (A.) *Étude sur les satires d'Horace*. *Alcan.* In-8. 11 fr.

Liet (A.) *Traité de prononciation française*. Paris, 1900. 8vo, 150 pp. 3 fr.

Maspero (G.) *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique*. Tome III. Paris, 1899. 8vo. 30 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen f. die Kunde des Morgenlandes, hrsg. v. der Deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft unter der Red. v. E. Windisch. XI. Bd. Nr. 2 u. 3. gr. 8. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus' Sort. in Komm.*—2. Meinhof (Carl). *Grundriss e. Lautlehre der Bantusprachen*. viii, 245 S. m. 1 farb. Karte. m. 8.—3. Hartmann (Mart.) *Lieder der Libyschen Wüste*. Die Quellen u. die Texte. vii, 243 S. m. 8.

Alfärābī. *Der Musterstaat*. Aus dem Arab. v. Frdr. Dieterici. Voran geht die Abhandlg.: "Ueber den Zusammenhang der arab. u. griech. Philosophie." gr. 8. viii, lxxix, 136 S. Leiden, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 5.

Archiv f. celtische Lexikographie. Hrsg. v. Whitley Stokes u. Kuno Meyer. 1. Bd. 3. Hft. gr. 8. S. 325-484 u. 81-112. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 6.

Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa. 4. Bd. 2. Hälfte. 2. Abtlg. gr. 8. Leipzig, *G. H. Wigand*. m. 12.—4. Alfred's, König, Uebersetzung v. Bedas Kirchengeschichte. Hrsg. v. Jac. Schipper. 2. Hälfte. 2. Abtlg. v, xi-xlv u. S. 513-743 m. 2 Taf. m. 12.

Blaydes (Freder. H. M.) *Adversaria critica in Sophoclem*, scripsit ac collegit B. gr. 8. iv, 290 S. Halle, *Buchh. des Waisenhauses*. m. 6.

Braune (Wilh.) *Die Handschriftenverhältnisse des Nibelungenliedes*. [Aus 'Beitr. z. Gesch. d. deut. Sprache u. Litt.'] gr. 8. 222 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 6.

Corpus glossariorum latinorum. Vol. VI. Fasc. II. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 18.—VI. *Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum* confecit Geo. Goetz. Pars I. Fasc. II. S. 369-754. m. 18.

Dittenberger (Guilelm.) *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. Iterum ed. D. Vol. II. gr. 8. v, 825 S. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*. m. 18.

Gerber (A.) et Greef (A.) *Lexicon Taciteum*. Fasc. XIV, edidit A. Greef. Lex. 8. S. 1489-1600. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.60.

Gliese (Wilh.) Kurze Einführung in das Studium des Gotischen. gr. 8. iv, 103 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. m. 2.

Hildebrandt (Rich.) Beiträge zur Erklärung des Gedichtes Aetna. Progr. 4. 37 S. Leipzig, *Dürr'sche Buchh. in Komm.* m. 1.50.

Holder (Alfr.) Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz. 12. Lfg. gr. 8. Sp. 769-1024. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Kunze (Alfr.) Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik. I: mea refert. gr. 8. vi, 20 S. Leipzig, *Simmel & Co.* m. 1.

Lautensach (O.) Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern u. Komikern. Augment u. Reduplikation. gr. 8. viii, 192 S. Hannover, *Hahn*. m. 4.

Leviticus (F.) Laut- u. Flexionslehre der Sprache der St. Servatiuslegende Heinrichs v. Veldeke. gr. 8. vii, 134 S. m. 3 Tab. Haarlem. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. m. 5.

Liebenam (W.) Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche. gr. 8. xviii, 577 S. Leipzig, *Duncker & Humblot*. m. 4.

Ludwich (Arth.) Textkritische Untersuchungen üb. die mythologischen Scholien zu Homer's Ilias: I. Progr. hoch 4. 28 S. Königsberg, *Akadem. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel*. m. —30.

Mémoires de la société finno-ougrienne. XIII u. XIV. gr. 8. Helsingfors. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*.—XIII. Ovigstad (J.) u. Wiklund (K. B.) Bibliographie der lappischen Litteratur. 162 S. m. 4.—XIV. Pipping (Hugo). Zur Phonetik der finnischen Sprache. 236 S. m. 4 Taf. m. 6.

Meurer (H.) Pauli sextani liber. Ed. altera. gr. 8. iv, 172 S. Weimar, *H. Böhlau's Nachf.* m. 1.50.

Müller (C. O.) u. Wieseler (F.) Antike Denkmäler zur griechischen Götterlehre. 4. Ausg. v. Konr. Wernicke. Denkmäler der alten Kunst. II. Tl. 4. Ausg. 2. Lfg. Poseidon. Demeter u. Kore. gr. 8. S. 141-262 m. 10 Taf. in qu. gr. 4. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. m. 5.

Osthoff (Herm.) Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen. gr. 4. 95 S. Heidelberg, *A. Wolff in Komm.* m. 4.

Palaestra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl u. Erich Schmidt. VI u. X. gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*.—VI. Märkisch (Rob.) Die altenglische Bearbeitung der Erzählung v. Apollonius v. Tyrus. Grammatik u. latein. Text. 62 S. m. 1.60.—X. Churchill (George B.) Richard III up to Shakespeare. xiii, 548 S. m. 16.

Palander (H.) Die althochdeutschen Tiernamen. I. Die Namen der Säugetiere. Diss. gr. 8. xv, 71 S. Darmstadt. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 4.

Preuner (Erich.) Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk. gr. 8. 115 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.20.

Radloff (W.) Die Sprachen der türkischen Stämme. 1. Abth.: Proben der Volksliteratur. VIII. Thl.: Mundarten der Osmanen. Gesammelt u. übers. v. Ign. Kúnos. gr. 8. ii, xlii, 588 S. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort. in Komm.* m. 15.

Ribbeck (Otto). Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. II. Augusteisches Zeitalter. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. vii, 373 S. Stuttgart, *J. G. Cotta Nachf.* m. 8.75.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten. Hrsg. v. Otto

Bremer. VI. Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel*.—VI. Weise (Osc.) Syntax der Altenburger Mundart. xii, 164 S. m. 5.

Schleicher's (A. W.) Somali-Texte. Hrsg. v. Leo Reinisch. gr. 8. xx, 159 S. Wien, *A. Hölder*. m. 4.

Schmidt (P. W.) Ueber das Verhältniss der melanesischen Sprachen zu den polynesischen u. untereinander. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 8. 93 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 2.10.

Schöne (Alfr.) Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus. gr. 8. xiii, 280 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 8.

Schulthess (Frdr.) Homonyme Wurzeln im Syrischen. gr. 8. xiii, 104 S. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichardt*. m. 4.

Senecae (L. Annaei) opera quae supersunt. Vol. I. Fasc. II. L. Annaei Senecae de beneficiis libri VII, de clementia libri II. Ed. Carol. Hosius. 8. xxvi, 267 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Silberstein (Emil.) Conrad Pellicanus. gr. 8. viii, 104 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 2.

Stowasser (J. M.) Lateinisch-deutsches Schulwörterbuch. 2. Aufl. Lex. 8. xx, 1104 S. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Bound, m. 11.

Taciti (C. Cornelii) dialogus de oratoribus. Recognovit Alfr. Schöne. gr. 8. iv, 95 S. Dresden (Schumannstr. 44), *A. Schöne*. m. 3.

Tschernjaew (Paul.) Terentiana. gr. 8. 17 S. Kasan. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.50.

Veröffentlichungen, wissenschaftliche, der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. 1. Hft. Fol. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—1. Koldewey (Rob.) Die hettitische Inschrift. Gefunden in der Königsburg v. Babylon am 22. VIII. 1899 u. veröffentlicht. Mit 1 Abbildg. u. 3 Taf. 8 S. m. 4.

Wendel (Carol.) De nominibus bucolicis. [Aus 'Jahrb. f. class. Philol.'] gr. 8. 90 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.40.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. 2. Reihe. II. Bd. 3. Hft. (XIII. der ganzen Folge). gr. 8. Leipzig, *E. Pfeiffer*.—3. Zu semitischen Inschriften. IV. CIAR 198. V. Manna.—Zur altarab. Zeitrechng.—Der Interrex bei den Sabäern.—Himmel, Kalender u. Mythos.—Die Kanaanäer v. Lagash. iii u. S. 321-400. m. 4.40.

Witte (Guilelm.) De Nicolai Damasceni fragmentorum romanorum fontibus. Diss. gr. 8. 50 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.20.

Zingler (Johs.) De Cicerone historico quaestiones. Diss. gr. 8. iv, 38 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.20.

ITALIAN.

Bonaventura (Arnaldo). La poesia neo-latina in Italia dal secolo XIV al presente. Città di Castello. 16mo, p. 409. L. 4.

De Anna (Luigi). L'articolo nominale e l'articolo verbale nella lingua francese. Milano. 16mo, p. 160. L. 2.

Grünwald-Gatti. Gran dizionario delle lingue italiana e tedesca. 2 voll. Livorno. 4to, p. 1500. L. 25.

Plutarco. Vita di Catone Maggiore a cura di V. Brugnola. Testo e commento. Firenze. 16mo, legato. L. 2.

Pullé. Studi italiani di filologia Indo-Iranica. Vol. III. Pisa. p. 160. L. 15.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Alden (R. M.) *The Rise of Formal Satire in England under Classical Influence.* (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Philology, Literature and Archaeology, vol. VII, no. 2.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899.

Aristotle, *The Ethics of, (Ἠθικὰ Νικομάχεια).* Ed., with an introduction and notes, by John Burnet. London, *Methuen & Co.*, 1900. 15s.

Brugmann (Karl). *Der Ursprung der Barytona auf -σος.* (Abdruck aus den 'Berichten der Königl. Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,' 14. Nov. 1899.)

Caesaris (C. Iulii) *Commentarii De Bello Civili*, Schüler-Commentar zu, von Franz Klaschka. 1. Heft, I. u. II. Buch. 2. Heft, III. u. IV. Buch. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. @ 1 m. 40 pf. (geb.).

Colin (T. F.) *Contes et Sayuètes.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Cook (A. S.) *The Christ of Cynewulf.* Ed., with introd., notes and glossary. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Dante Society, *Seventeenth Annual Report of the.* McKenzie (K.) *Dante's References to Aesop.*—Lane (W. C.) *Additions to the Dante Collection in the Harvard College Library.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Demosthenes. *On the Peace, Second Philippic, On the Chersonesus, and Third Philippic.* With introd. and critical and explanatory notes. By J. E. Sandys. London and New York, *Macmillans*, 1900.

Dictionnaire général de la langue française, par MM. Hatzfeld et Darmesteter avec le concours de M. Thomas. 28. fascicule. Paris, *Delagrave*, 1900. @ 1 fr.

Eckman (George P.) *Controversial Elements in Lucretius.* (N. Y. Univ. Diss., 1897.) 1899.

Ellis (Robinson). *Notes to Varro's R. R. II, III.* (Reprint from 'Hermathena,' vol. X, no. XXV.)

Empire of the South (The): An Exposition of the Present Resources and Development of the South, by Frank Presbrey. Published by *The Southern Railway Co.* (W. A. Turk, General Agent, Washington, D. C.), 1899.

English Dictionary (The Oxford). Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. GLASS-COACH-GRADED (Vol. IV). By Henry Bradley.

— *IN-INFER (Vol. V).* Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900. @ \$1.25.

Euripides. *Andromache.* Ed. by A. R. F. Hyslop. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.

— *Iphigenia auf Tauris.* Herausg. v. Siegfried Reiter. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 1 m. 60 pf. (geb.).

Farquhar (Edward). *Elements of Unity in the Homeric Poems. Part I.* (Limestone College Studies, I 3.) Gaffney, S. C., *Limestone College Press*, 1900. 5 cts.

Fitz Hugh (Thomas). Decennial Report, 1889-1899. School of Latin. University of Texas. Outlines of a System of Classical Pedagogy. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1900.

Fletcher (W. I.) and Bowker (R. R.) The Annual Literary Index, 1899. New York, *Office of the Publishers' Weekly*.

Frisbie (I. F.) The Beginner's Greek Book. Boston, *E. E. Babb & Co.*, 1898.

Gower, The Complete Works of. Edited from the MSS, with introductions, notes and glossaries. By G. C. Macaulay. The French Works. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1899. For sale by Cushing & Co., Baltimore.

Gray (Louis H.) The Indo-Iranian Deity Apam Napat. (Separat-Abdruck aus 'Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.') Tübingen, *Mohr*, 1900.

— Parallels in Pali and New Persian Phonology. (From the 'Journal of the American Oriental Society, XX, 1899, pp. 229-43.)

Hanssen (Friedrich). Zur spanischen u. portugiesischen Metrik. (Separat-abzug aus den 'Verhandlungen des Deutschen wissenschaftlichen Vereins in Santiago, Bd. IV.) Valparaiso, *Guillermo Hermann*, 1900.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. X. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899.

Hempl (George). Origin of the Latin Letters G and Z. (Extract 'Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.,' vol. XXX, 1899.)

Johnson (C. W. L.) The Motion of the Voice in the Theory of Ancient Music. (Extract from 'Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.,' vol. XXX, 1899.)

Keelhoff (J.) Revue de Riemann et Goelzer, Syntaxe comparée. (Revue de l'Instruction publique en Belgique, XLIII, 1^{re} liv., 1900.)

King (L. W.) Babylonian Religion and Mythology. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.* New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1899.

Klaschka (Franz). Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Cato Maior de Senectute. 70 pf.

— Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Laelius de Amicitia. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 80 pf.

Knauth (Hermann). Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen in das Lateinische für Abiturienten. 3. Aufl. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1900. 1 m. 50 pf.

Kurrelmeyer (William). The Historical Development of the Types of First Plural Imperative in German. (J. H. U. Diss.) Strassburg, *Trübner*, 1900.

Liden (Evald). Studien zur altindischen u. vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1897.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita liber XXXXV. Herausg. v. Wilhelm Krüger, mit erkl. Anmerkungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 90 pf.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of the. Ed. by J. W. Bright. Vol. XV, No. 1. (N. S., Vol. VIII, No. 1.) I. The Lambeth Version of Havelock. By E. K. Putnam.—II. La Vie de Ste. Catherine d'Alexandrie. By H. A. Todd.—III. Philology and Purism. By H. C. G. v. Jagemann.—IV. Interpretative Syntax. By C. Alphonso Smith.—V. Influence of the Court Masques on the Drama, 1608-15. By A. H. Thorndike. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1900.

Mohl (F. Geo.) Les Origines Romanes. Étude sur le lexique du Latin

vulgaire. (Mémoire de la Société royale des Sciences de Bohême.) Prague, 1900.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 15: Linie-halten-mörderhaft. Vollst. in 24 Lfgn. N. Y., *International News Co.* @ 1 m. 50 pf.

Nepos (Cornelius), Weidner's Schulwörterbuch zu. Bearb. v. J. Schmidt. 2te Aufl., mit 85 Abbildgn. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1900. 2 m.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Altertümer u. für Paedagogik. III. Jahr. V. u. VI. Bdes. 2. u. 3. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1900.

Oliver (Andrew). Observations on the Use of Certain Prepositions in Petronius, with special reference to the Roman Sermo Plebeius. San Francisco, 1899.

Osgood (Charles Grosvenor, Jr.) The Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems. (Yale Studies in English—Albert S. Cook, Editor—VIII.) New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1900.

Osthoff (Hermann). Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erweiterte akademische Rede. Heidelberg, *Alfred Wolff*, 1900.

Perrot (Georges). Value to History of the Study of the Fine Arts. Translated and annotated by D. Cady Eaton. (Reprinted from 'Popular Science Monthly,' Dec. 1899.)

Plautus, The Captivi of. Ed., with notes and stage-directions, by G. E. Barber. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1900.

Prince (J. Dyneley). Some Passamaquoddy Witchcraft Tales. The Passamaquoddy Wampum Records. Some Passamaquoddy Documents. (Reprints from 'Annals N. Y. Academy of Sciences,' 1897-99.)

Renard (Mme. Georges). Trois Contes de Noël. Ed. by F. Th. Meylan. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Revue des Humanités en Belgique. Publication trimestrielle. Janv. 1900. Hasselt. *La Rédaction.* 5 fr. un an.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Hrsg. v. Bücheler u. Usener. N. F. LV, 1 u. 2. Frankfurt a. M., *Sauerländer*, 1900.

Sanskrit-English Dictionary (A). Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages. By Sir Monier Monier-Williams. New ed., greatly enlarged and improved with the collaboration of Prof. E. Leumann (Strassburg) and C. Capeller (Jena), and other scholars. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. London, Edinburgh, New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900. Cloth, \$18.40.

Schöne (Alfred). Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 8 m.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Lucreti De Rerum Natura Libri Sex. Recogn. Cyrillus Bailey. 3s.

— Platonis Opera. Tom. I. Tetralogiae I-II. Recogn. J. Burnet. 6s.

— Taciti Opera Minora. Recogn. H. Furneaux. 2s.

— Thucydidis Historiae. Tom. I. Libri I-IV. Recogn. H. Stuart Jones. 3s. 6d. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900.

Sihler (E. G.) The Treatise *περί ψυχῆς*. (Extract from 'Proceedings of the Am. Phil. Assoc.,' vol. XXX, 1899.)

Smith (C. Alphonso). *Interpretative Syntax*. (Reprint from 'Trans. M. L. Assoc.')

Baltimore, 1900.

Smyth (Herbert Weir). *Greek Melic Poets*. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1900.

Spofford (Ainsworth R.) *The Coming of the White Man and the Founding of the National Capital*. (Proceedings of the Washington Academy of Sciences, January 18, 1900.) Washington, D. C., *The Academy*, 1900.

Tacitus. *Agricola*. Ed. by Alfred Gudeman. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1900. \$1.

Verlags-Katalog. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900.

West (A. F.) *Is there a Democracy of Studies?* (Reprinted from 'The Atlantic Monthly' for December, 1899.)

Wilhelm (Adolf). *ἔρος and ἐνιανρός*. (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Bd. CXLII.) Wien, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1900.

— Ein Brief der Kaiserin Plotina. *Simonideische Gedichte*. (Sonderabdrücke aus den 'Jahresheften des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes,' Bd. II, 1899.)